University of Alberta

Pedagogical Change:
Using Drama to Develop the Critical Imagination

by

M. Susan Spence-Campbell

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Department of Secondary Education

Edmonton, Alberta
Spring 2008

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-45643-9
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-45643-9

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

ABSTRACT

This study examined how the use of drama as a pedagogical tool can encourage teachers to teach social studies in the elementary school. Through a socially critical action research project teachers recognized that students activated their critical imagination, the ability to think critically in an imaginary situation. In addition, the students made informed decisions, developed creative responses, and demonstrated ethical judgment, all components of the vision statement of the *Foundation for the Atlantic Canada social studies curriculum* developed by the Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation (APEF).

The dramatic structures of Dorothy Heathcote and Augusto Boal were used to develop the drama units in an attempt to fulfill key stage outcomes of the APEF. Data were collected over a period of three years from eleven classes ranging from grade primary (kindergarden) to grade 6.

Significant incidents from data collected through field notes, videotapes and artifacts are depicted through scripted vignettes. The findings of this study suggest that using drama as a pedagogical tool not only fulfills but exceeds the key stage outcomes for social studies at all grade levels in the elementary school.

The stories of the teachers recount their journeys from being disillusioned with both social studies curriculum and their teaching methodologies to discovering the satisfaction of actively engaging with their students in social studies. As their experience grew they came to recognize how drama can be used as a pedagogical tool in all subject areas.

DEDICATION

To teachers who strive to make a difference.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An erfahrung of this magnitude cannot be traveled alone. It is only with the support and faith of others that anyone can safely arrive. Now that I've arrived I would like to thank all who helped along the way.

The Alberta Connection

I would like to thank my supervisor, George Richardson, for his excellent guidance and unwavering support throughout this study. To the other members of my supervisory committee, Joyce Bainbridge and Diane Conrad, whose insightful criticisms and contributions helped to clarify my thinking, thank you. Your words of advice challenged me to delve deeper.

I had invaluable conversations with David Barnet whose understanding of drama never failed to add to my "aha" moments.

At Jean Clandinin's Tuesday table I found advice, conversation, encouragement, and friendship. Jean's words, "You're going to unpack that, aren't you?" helped me to understand the richness of my data. Another's, "Sounds like a play to me," inspired the presentation of my data. I cannot express how important Tuesdays became to me.

Raj Boora and the Division of Technology in Education were instrumental in helping me learn how to edit video. The "Fish Bowl" became a home away from home.

The Nova Scotian Connection

I would like to thank the students of my school whose enthusiasm brightened every day, and who continually astounded me with their insights. I cannot count the

number of times one would stop me in the hallway and ask, "When are we doing drama again?"

Without the teachers at my school the study would not have taken place. Thank you for seeing value in what I proposed and being willing to step outside your comfort zones.

I would like to thank my school board for acknowledging that teachers need time to study and for providing me with release time from my classroom to collect data and a sabbatical leave to attend University of Alberta.

I am so fortunate to have family who believes in me. To my mother and my children, I thank them for all their words of encouragement.

Lastly, I would like to thank my husband, fraser, for his excellent editing skills, his patience, our innumerable discussions, and his belief in my ability to accomplish this.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Signature Page
Dedication
Abstract
Acknowledgement
Table of Contents

Chapter One Identification of a Problem

Introduction 1
How I came to this point 2
The Current Ideal of Social Studies in Atlantic Canada 5
Critical Thinking 7
Citizenship 8
Global Interdependence 10
Ethical Judgement 10
The Reality of Social Studies 11
Textbooks 12
Social Studies in the Elementary Classroom 13
A Possible Solution 14
Research Questions that were Pursued 14
Significance of the Study 15
Assumptions 15

Chapter Two Literature Review 17

The Possibilities of Drama 17
Critical Imagination 18
Citizenship Education 23
Drama Theorists and the Imagination 24
Community 25
Empathy and Imagination 26
Current Use of Drama in Elementary Schools in Nova Scotia 28
Models of Drama: The Theory Behind the Models 30
Drama Structures 33
Heathcote's Structures 33
Boal's Structures 38
Social Studies, Moral Education and Drama 42
Storytelling 46

Chapter Three Methodology 49

Educational Action Research 49
Types of Action Research 52
Choosing Socially Critical Action Research 55
Participation 58
Direction 58
Consciousness 58
Constraints 59
Outcomes 61
Research Participants 61
The Role of the Researcher: Participant, Teacher, Facilitator 63
Drama Units 66
Data Collection 70
Action Research Fractal 73
Data Analysis 74
Trustworthiness 77
Ethical Considerations 78

Chapter Four The Data: It's all in the Play 79

Theme One The Use of Power and Authority: Who's got the Power? 82
Jack and the Bean Stalk 82
Research Sub-questions 89
Outcomes of the APEF 90
Tinker Jim 91
Research Sub-questions 94
Outcomes of the APEF 96
Theme Two Developing and Supporting Opinions: But I believe. 97

Jack and the Bean Stalk 97
Research Sub-questions 100
Outcomes of the APEF 101
A Highwayman Comes Riding 101
If My Mom. 102
Research Sub-questions 106
Outcomes of the APEF 108
In the Earliest of Times 108
Consensus Circle 109
Research Sub-questions 112
Outcomes of the APEF 114
Theme Three Showing Kindness: Let me help you 114
Tinker Jim 114

In the Earliest of Times 115

Theme Four Accepting Responsibility: It's my fault 115
A Highwayman Comes Riding 116

The Investigation Results 116
In the Earliest of Times 117
Conclusion 118

Chapter Five The Data: Scambell City 120

Do You Swear to Tell The Truth? 123
Theme One: The Use of Power and Authority: Who's Got the Power? 128
Theme Two: Developing and Supporting Opinion: But I believe. 129
Theme Three: Accepting Responsibility: Okay, I'll do it 130
Research Sub-questions 131
Outcomes of the APEF 133
Scambell City Senate Meeting 134

Theme One: The Use of Power and Authority: Who's Got the Power? 141
Theme Two: Developing and Supporting Opinion: But I think. 143
Theme Three: Accepting Responsibility: I'll take care of that 145
Research Sub-questions 146
Outcomes of the APEF 147
Conclusion 149

Chapter Six Findings and Conclusions: Have we been transformed? .. 150

Heathcote and Boal 151
Belief 153
Was it Socially Critical Action Research? 155
The Teachers 155
Lily 156
Belinda 157
June 157
New Practices 158
Recognizing Hegemony 163
Constraints 164
APEF Outcomes 167
Research Question 168
My Practice 169
But My Mom. 171
Conclusion 174

References 177

CHAPTER ONE

IDENTIFICATION OF A PROBLEM

Introduction

Within this dissertation there exist two main threads, social studies as curriculum and the use of drama as a pedagogical tool. Through my research, I attempted to weave these threads together to create possibilities for a new curriculum fabric for elementary teaching. Despite being mandated, social studies within the elementary school has typically been considered an extra (Egan, 1999). The main foci continue to be reading, writing and mathematics. But the Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation (APEF) created a document in 1999 that suggested that social studies be seen in a new light. In this document social studies is not viewed as a series of facts and dates but rather as "curriculum [that] integrates concepts, processes and ways of thinking drawn from the diverse disciplines of the humanities, social sciences and pure sciences" (APEF, 1999, p. 2). Teachers were provided with detailed outcomes to be accomplished, but were given little methodology and few resources for doing so. In response to this significant challenge to successful implementation, one possibility is to use drama as a vehicle for the teaching of social studies. In North America, Australia and England a number of theorists (J. Clark, 1997; Edmiston, 2000; Heathcote, Johnson, & O'Neill, 1991; Neelands, 1992; O'Neill & Lambert, 1982; O'Toole & Dunn, 2002; Somers, 1994; Wilhelm & Edmiston, 1998; Winston, 2000a) have developed drama structures to teach across curriculum. It was to these structures, as well as others, that I turned to find possibilities for the teaching of social studies through drama.

How I came to this point

I was a newcomer to the field of drama in education. My major in my undergraduate degree was Spanish; so how did a teacher with no training in drama develop such a passion for drama education? "We don't have a drama club and you look like the kind of person who would do drama," cajoled Tanya, a student. And so, in 1994, I was flattered into beginning an after-school drama club which led to a unit of drama in my grade 9 English classes. That was how it began: a life-long love for theatre was translated into drama clubs and then into drama in the classroom. There was no epiphany, but, rather, there was a gradual realization that drama was motivating to students. "I can't believe that I **want** to be in English," was a comment from a particularly unenthusiastic student. Small successes made me realize that there was much potential for the use of drama in the classroom.

Unfortunately, few opportunities were available to allow me to acquire a formal education in drama. There were no university courses available in Nova Scotia in drama education, but in 1997 the Nova Scotia Department of Education and Culture decreed that all students must take a fine arts course in order to graduate from high school. Therefore, the department had to provide training for teachers who were asked or volunteered to teach drama. An intensive, week-long workshop was set up for that purpose, which I was fortunate to attend. I joined the Educational Drama Association of Nova Scotia and attended their conferences. I borrowed books from high school drama teacher friends. In the summer of 1998, Mount Saint Vincent University brought Dr. Joe Norris from the University of Alberta to teach a

graduate course in process drama in the classroom and I was able to take my first drama education course.

At the same time I was experimenting more and more in my grade 5-6 classroom. I had begun by playing drama games that helped to create a strong sense of community among the students, but I found the students unwilling to progress beyond the playing of games. When do they begin to take the risks, I wondered? It became apparent that a more controlled use of the games was essential. Consequently, I began to integrate role-playing early in the school year. In the process of incorporating drama into my classrooms, there were some important discoveries about drama itself. I discovered that drama was not a linear process but rather a constant weaving back and forth between activities that teach dramatic techniques and those that require the use of dramatic techniques. I also became aware that this non-linear process reflected my own paradigm of learning.

It was during these initial stages that I identified a serious problem. There was little developed curriculum using drama as the primary pedagogical tool. Consequently, during 1998 in the summer graduate course with Dr. Joe Norris, I took the time to develop a drama-oriented unit on the Mi'kmaq, a social studies unit I had previously taught many times in grades 5-6.

Three months of experiences culminating in a living museum of Mi'kmaq culture convinced me that drama provided an extremely effective vehicle through which to teach. It was fun for the students and stimulating for me. And the students were learning. Having taught the Mi'kmaq unit for several years using the same resource material, I was able to compare my current students' understandings with

those of past students. Previously I had received well-constructed projects, which demonstrated a great deal of content knowledge. As a result of the drama activities, the students demonstrated an empathy that I had not seen from other students in previous years. After attempting to construct a *wikoum*, one student remarked how difficult the task was. He then looked at me and said, "Their life was really hard, wasn't it?" While creating the vignettes for the museum, students used the information presented to them to construct their interpretation of Native life, rather than to echo the researched information. For a short period of time the students felt as if they had become Mi'kmaq. For me, the value for using drama within the curriculum was solidified.

I chose to use social studies as the curricular focus of my research because of my experience with social studies as a student. I had memorized the names and dates of all the kings and queens of England. I had memorized the names of all the states and their capitals. I had memorized the names and dates of wars and treaties. History, in my experience, was little more than a list of facts and figures. But I had two memorable experiences in Grade 11, one of my own making, the other provided by the teacher. The first revolved around a new textbook, one that is still in use today, that my class was piloting. On the cover of this text was a painting by Picasso entitled *Guernica*. The painting was never discussed in class but it made a profound impression on me. I read the brief description on the inside cover, but looking at the cover allowed me to experience the horror of the Spanish Civil War. I had an emotional reaction to that historical event. For the first time I empathized and visualized rather than memorized. Later that year, which for the most part had

included the memorization of dates and facts, we were studying the Russian Revolution. In addition to using the textbook, our teacher read to us from the book *Nicolas and Alexandra* (Massie, 1967). The story of Rasputin and his influence fascinated me, the plight of the tzar and his family touched me. For those brief moments, history came alive.

Unfortunately history again regressed to memorization and facts and dates until I met Dr. Antonio Ruiz Salvador at Dalhousie University. He refused to let anyone take notes in class. He wanted us to know the stories behind the dates and the names. I read articles written by several people about the same event and came to understand that history was made up of stories that constantly fluctuated depending on the teller. There were few facts, everything depended on perspective.

So in choosing a subject area in which to pursue a research project, I wanted to provide exciting learning experiences that I had not experienced for the most part as a student and I was concerned that students continued to lack. In addition, the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999) had been recently developed and the recommendations from it appeared to support what my influential educational experiences had shown me about what social studies could be. The combination of my personal experience and the government's forward thinking reflected in the APEF document cemented my decision to use social studies in my research project.

The Current Ideal of Social Studies in Atlantic Canada

As an elementary classroom teacher in rural Nova Scotia, I had been given a mandate by the Nova Scotia Department of Education: "The Atlantic Canada social studies curriculum will enable and encourage students to examine issues, respond

critically and creatively, and make informed decisions as individuals and as citizens of Canada and of an increasingly interdependent world" (APEF, 1999, p. v). This is the vision statement of the Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation for social studies, a vision that finds support in the work of philosopher Martha Nussbaum. Nussbaum states, "In order to foster a democracy that is reflective and deliberative, rather than simply a marketplace of competing interest groups, a democracy that genuinely takes thought for the common good, we must produce citizens who have the Socratic capacity to reason about their beliefs" (1997, p. 19).

How did I, as a classroom teacher, interpret this vision statement; what did it mean to me? To respond critically and creatively and to make informed decisions implied the use of critical thinking. However, although many scholars identify critical thinking as essential to social studies education, there was a great deal of disagreement about what critical thinking meant. I. Wright (1997) indicates that there are a variety of approaches to critical thinking, and some scholars believe that critical thinking constitutes a discipline on its own (Beyer, 1998). Bailin, Case, Coombs and Daniels (1999) in stating that critical thinking is a quality of thinking dependent on background knowledge challenge Kirby and Kuykendall's (1991) theory that states that critical thinking is generic, Beyer's belief that critical thinking is a skill that is separate from knowledge, and Chuska's (1986) thoughts that critical thinking is a process of thinking rather than a quality of thinking. Together, Bailin *et al* challenged me to reflect on my own philosophy of learning which includes the belief that "The whole is not merely the sum of separately identifiable parts" (Weaver, 1985, p. 299). I do not think we can separate critical thinking into separate slots.

How can it exist without a context? How can it exist without knowledge? How can it not be judged on its quality? And quality depends on the context.

Critical Thinking

As indicated above, Bailin (1998) believes that critical thinking is not a generic skill but rather that it is related to background knowledge. She states that, "Background knowledge in the particular area is a precondition for critical thinking to take place. . . . I cannot think critically about historical situations re-created in a role drama if I do not have knowledge of the historical context" (1998, p. 147). My own experience with students tells me that the more background knowledge students have about an historical situation, the better able they are to critique a text, a poem or a drama. For example, Longfellow's poem *Evangeline* (2004) does not give students enough of a picture of the expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to understand all the competing agendas at the time or to understand that Longfellow painted a very romantic version of the situation. This is not to suggest that events similar to the ones Longfellow described did not take place, but only that there are numerous perspectives to take into consideration in order to understand and critique the whole event.

As Bailin (1998) notes, we think differently depending on the situation and our knowledge of the situation, and as a result one can conclude that knowledge is essential to critical thinking. Critical thinking is not knowledge but critical thinking cannot exist without knowledge. Bailin states that, "critical thinking involves thinking through problematic situations about what to believe or how to act where the thinker makes reasoned judgements that embody the attributes of quality

thinking" (p.146). She suggests that it is the quality of thinking that distinguishes critical from uncritical thinking. Unless a student challenges his or her beliefs, then the student's thinking cannot be viewed as critical. Thus, critical thinking "is always in response to a particular task, question, problematic situation or challenge. . . . Critical thinking requires assessment and reasoned judgment" (Bailin, 1998, p. 148). Although they are not explicitly stated, these requirements imply that other values are also needed when involved in critical thinking, including discipline, open-mindedness, sensitivity and fairness. Each of these values is suggested in the citizenship outcomes of the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999).

Citizenship

It is within the APEF vision statement that the civic context for an examination of issues is also identified. It states, "The Atlantic Canada social studies curriculum will enable and encourage students to examine issues, respond critically and creatively, and make informed decisions as individuals and as citizens of Canada and of an increasingly interdependent world" (APEF, 1999, p. v). According to the APEF Social Studies Foundation document, then, students must examine issues as citizens of Canada. As a citizen, an individual is "a member of a state, subject to its government and its laws, benefiting from its protection, enjoying whatever rights it confers, and fulfilling whatever duties it extracts" (Osborne, 1997, p. 39). Citizenship is the fulfillment of those duties. "It is intensely value laden, embodying a set of ideals that represent what citizens ought to be and how they ought to live in order to enjoy the rights of citizenship" (Osborne, 1997, p. 39). Within the Social Studies Foundation document of the APEF (1999), the key outcomes of "Citizenship,

Power and Governance" help define those values and ideals. Under the curriculum outcome entitled "Citizenship" students are expected to:

- identify and explain the rights and responsibilities of individual citizens in a local, national, and global context
- understand and give examples of the influence of freedom, equality, human dignity, justice, and civic rights and responsibilities in Canadian society
- explain ways that individuals and groups can influence public policy in Canada
- recognize how and why individuals and groups have different perspectives on public lives
- take age-appropriate actions to demonstrate their responsibilities as citizens (p.16)

These outcomes describe citizens who should be active participants with democratic values; this implies citizens who are capable of critical thinking and who demonstrate ethical judgment, qualities that Kymlicka (1995) feels are necessary for a modern democracy. Kymlicka suggests that in order for a modern democracy to function well, it "depends . . . on the qualities and attitudes of its citizens: e.g. . . . their ability to tolerate and work together with others who are different from themselves; their desire to participate in the political process in order to promote the public good . . . ; their sense of justice" (p. 175).

Global Interdependence

The APEF vision statement concludes with a reference to "[citizens] of an increasingly interdependent world," which introduces the concept of global interdependence. We live in a world whose political divisions are undergoing radical changes. The idea that the world can be divided into distinct entities called nations with relative homogeneity of language and culture has undergone radical changes in the latter part of the twentieth century (Osborne, 1997; Merryfield & Subedi, 2001; Richardson, 2004). The borders between nations have blurred; free trade agreements abound; emigration from one country to another has created heterogeneous states. Students need to recognize the consequences of these changes, one of which is the growing interdependence of all peoples and nations. Interdependence indicates a reliance on each other, a moral commitment to help and support.

Ethical Judgment

Within the APEF (1999) vision statement there can also be seen an underlying requirement of *ethical judgement* (Winston, 1997). Winston introduced the term as a description of what was expected of individuals when faced with moral dilemmas, when conflicting pressures required decisions (p. 23). In critical thinking, a challenge to beliefs and values was required. In citizenship, an understanding of justice, freedom and equality was needed. And in global interdependence, a moral commitment to support others was essential. Each of these requirements could present conflicting pressures, thus ethical judgment becomes an integral aspect of social studies.

This vision statement of the APEF (1999) is comparable to many found in social studies curriculum guides of Canadian provinces (Shields & Ramsay, 2004; I. Wright, 1995). Sears notes, "there has been a shift in emphasis from the acquisition of knowledge to active citizen participation" (1997, p. 22). But evidence also told us that there was a wide chasm between what was advocated by curriculum guides and what was actually happening in the classroom (Sears, 1997; Shields & Ramsay, 2004). Why do teachers fail to teach what has been mandated by their respective departments of education?

The Reality of Social Studies

Despite the ideal construction of social studies noted above, impediments exist that made the achievement of the APEF (1999) social studies curriculum goals difficult. Chief among those difficulties is what might be termed the "reproductive agenda" of social studies. For example, Egan believes that social studies was invented not to educate children about the past but to socialize them to "share attitudes and values, and images of their nation" (1999, p. 140). The attitudes, values and images are those that perpetuate the hegemony of the dominant culture, namely white European male (Johnston, 2001; McCarthy, 1990; Reynolds, 2000; Sears, 1997). These attitudes, values and images were found in the content of social studies textbooks. According to Kincheloe, "Social studies textbooks are often not written to explore the world but merely to instruct – to let children know a safe but not necessarily accurate body of facts agreed to be inoffensive" (2001, p.60). Kincheloe's reference is to the textbooks that have been approved by departments of education from across North America.

Textbooks

Textbooks rather than curriculum guides influence what is taught in social studies. According to research there are many reasons why, but I will explore two. First, in those provinces that have standardized examinations written by students, most teachers feel obliged to present information that is consistent with what will appear on the examination. Farr Darling and Wright suggest that in standardized examinations, "the goal is to ascertain how much information students can remember . . ." (2004, p. 256). In those provinces that do not impose standardized examinations, most individual high schools write a common examination, again forcing teachers to follow a set curriculum, which generally included a particular text.

Secondly, textbooks approved by departments of education and provided by the school, encourage teachers to perpetuate the hegemony of the dominant culture (Kincheloe, 1989; Ross, 2001). Although the research cited refers to social studies within the United States, a Canadian investigation by Cummins and Danesi (1990) supports Kincheloe's contention. Cummins and Danesi suggest "that the current rhetoric of multiculturalism . . . is frequently at variance with the continuing underground reality of Anglo conformity" (p. 13). The white European perspective continues to create the image of the non-European "other" (Johnston, 2001). Varma-Joshi (2004) contends that "The multicultural policy has been disparaged as a 'largely superficial window-dressing exercise'" (p.150). Despite the existence of a multicultural policy within our education, little has been done to include a multicultural perspective in textbooks.

These constraints pertained only to high schools; do elementary and middle schools experience the same degree of uniformity? Unfortunately, for those classes that use textbooks the experience is similar. However, Egan (1999) questions how much social studies is actually taught in elementary schools.

Social Studies in the Elementary Classroom

In the primary grades, in particular, students tend to be more engaged in language arts and mathematics activities than in social studies (Bradley, 2004; Sears, 1997; Shields & Ramsay, 2004) despite social studies being a required subject (Nova Scotia, 2003). The APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999) was published in 1999 but an accompanying curriculum guide has yet to be developed. Teachers are left wondering what topics to include at which grade level. Because no guide has been published, there are no resources to support the framework in classrooms. In my own teaching context, anecdotal information certainly suggested that teachers in my school felt overwhelmed by the suggested outcomes. As one teacher commented, "The outcomes are unrealistic. How can you possibly achieve them?" Another teacher felt, "The outcomes are too abstract."

And so, in terms of its use in elementary classrooms three interrelated issues have made it difficult to successfully implement new social studies curriculum in Atlantic Canada. Social studies was not given adequate instruction time in the classroom and if it were being taught, the textbooks being used perpetuated a hegemonic view of the dominant culture. The outcomes suggested in the APEF Foundation document (1999) were not being addressed. There were few if any resources available to teachers to support the implementation of the new outcomes.

Given the problems these three issues posed to meaningful curriculum implementation, I felt that I needed to demonstrate to teachers that the outcomes in the Foundation document could be achieved through a drama-based action research project, and that together we could find or develop materials to support the outcomes. Because we did not have a new curriculum guide to suggest topic areas for different grade levels, we continued to follow the topics as presented in *Social Studies for Elementary Schools* (1981), the last available guide, but also incorporated the new outcomes.

A Possible Solution

Research Questions that were Pursued

In exploring how drama might be used to present social studies in classrooms from a variety of perspectives and to encourage the teaching of social studies, one main question with four sub-questions emerged:

In what ways can the use of drama as a pedagogical tool encourage teachers to teach social studies?

a) In what ways does drama enable students to make informed decisions about issues in social studies?

b) In what ways does drama enable students to develop creative responses in the examination of issues with social studies?

c) In what ways does drama promote the development of ethical judgment in students?

d) In what ways can drama provide for the development of the critical imagination in citizenship education?

Significance of the Study

My research was an attempt to provide teachers with a pedagogical tool to fulfill the outcomes of the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999) and to provide students, through the use of drama, with an engaged and empathetic understanding of social issues that, in turn, would lead to their development as more fully informed citizens. The scholarly literature demonstrates that, for the most part, social studies continues to be viewed as facts, figures and dates. But social studies should be about beliefs and values. The facts that appear in textbooks are not presented as a single perspective but as the truth. I attempted to change both the method and the material of teaching social studies in order that students could experience social studies as it has been suggested by the Nova Scotia Department of Education and the Atlantic Provinces Educational Foundation. In doing so, I hoped to encourage teachers to incorporate more social studies into their teaching.

Assumptions

The research in this dissertation operated under the following assumptions:

1. The vision statement and outcomes of the Foundation for the Atlantic Canada social studies curriculum were achievable.
2. The NS Department of Education expected teachers to implement such curriculum in their classrooms that attempted to fulfill the vision statement and the outcomes of the APEF Foundation document (1999).
3. Drama is a pedagogical tool that may help in fulfilling the vision statement.

4. The teachers who chose to participate in the action research project I outline in my dissertation were genuinely interested in fulfilling the vision statement and outcomes of the Foundation document.
5. Students were capable of applying the lessons learned through drama to their understanding of citizenship.

In summary, in this chapter I have explored the rationale surrounding my decision to undertake this study. I examined both the ideal and reality of social studies education in Atlantic Canada and I have suggested a means for improving it. I developed a research question with sub-questions that guided my study. In the following chapter I review the scholarly literature to support my contentions.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter I define the concept of drama as well as examine the theoretical framework of the critical imagination and how it relates to drama. I explore the meaning of citizenship education and moral education in the context of the Atlantic Protocol. Also, I develop the rationale for using drama in the curriculum through an in-depth look at the structures of two drama theorists, Dorothy Heathcote and Augusto Boal, and their relationship to cognitive theory. I conclude with a format for combining all the elements of the research.

The Possibilities of Drama

The use of drama in education offers teachers dynamic possibilities for the creation of community and the development of critical thinking that is essential to citizenship. But what do I mean by drama? In this case I use drama as a general term to describe kinds of activities. Later I use the term to describe a specific set of these activities. I set out in search of an explanation of drama that I hoped would encompass what occurred in my classroom. Drama appeared to present itself in many guises: "Dramatic activities in the classroom have been known as educational drama, classroom drama, informal drama, developmental drama, curriculum drama, improvisation, role drama, creative dramatics and creative drama" (O'Neill, 1995, p. xv). The use of a descriptor tends to be a reflection of the practice of a particular practitioner. Unfortunately, the nuances that accompany the adjective may not be readily known to those not associated with that particular practice. O'Neill includes "process" as a new descriptor but recognizes that attaching a new label does not solve the problem of the limitation of naming. Others in the field have either dropped the descriptors

or never invoked them (Bolton & Heathcote, 1995; J. Clark, 1997; Neelands, 1998; Somers, 1994; Wilhelm & Edmiston, 1998). As I am not aligning myself with a single understanding of drama, I have chosen to refrain from employing any qualifier, and will simply use the term "drama."

O'Neill's (1995) succinct description of drama as "exploratory dramatic activity where the emphasis is on process rather than on product" (p. xv) begins to describe my thinking about what drama is. Renk (1993) further explains that drama is "a personal process of exploring an analogous context, of making sense of life in a symbolic fashion" (p. 196). It is the combination of these two descriptions that begins to depict my view of drama: it is an exploratory activity in which students are challenged to make sense of an imaginary life. I would further add that drama is not a linear sequence of dramatic events but a complex activity in which the students negotiate and renegotiate meaning. The practice is adaptive to the needs of the situation. The teacher who introduces the topic does not dictate what should happen but, rather, allows the students to determine the outcomes as they participate and take direction from each other. The needs of the situation will arise and be dealt with. In this way, the students own the curriculum by having a vested interest in it. In order for students to participate in this imaginary situation, the critical imagination must be stimulated.

Critical Imagination

The term critical imagination has been used to describe various circumstances. Bland (2004) uses it to describe students imagining new and creative responses to improve their own personal lives. Murray and Ozanne (1991) use the term to describe consumers' imagining alternative social organizations. The term has also been used in literary criticism (Blythe & Nemoianu, 1979). But my

interpretation of the term is distinct. My definition describes a situation that requires thinking critically while in an imaginary setting. In the imaginary situation students encounter dilemmas that they would not normally be exposed to. They are asked to behave and think as if a situation were real. Students are given the opportunity to experiment with thoughts and ideas under non-threatening circumstances. The thoughts that they express are not their own but those of the characters that they have assumed and they will not be judged by them. There exists a kind of freedom from societal norms and social constraints because the situation is viewed as a possibility, not as a reality. By encouraging the development of the critical imagination through these kinds of experiences, students are exposed to long-term learning.

These kinds of impressionable experiences have been termed *Erfahrung*. *Erfahrung* (van Manen, 2005), meaning formative experiences, is related to *Fahren*, a German word meaning to travel by boat, or to drive by car. Through teachers providing *Erfahrung*, students have an opportunity to experience *Erlebnis*, a lived experience (Gadamer, 1975). But this experience is not an everyday passing experience; it is an experience with purpose, an experience that is not forgotten, that ". . . belongs to the unity of this self and thus contains an unmistakable and irreplaceable relation to the whole of this one life" (Gadamer, 1975, p. 67).

The role of the teacher, in using drama structures, is to create an itinerary for the imaginary expedition, the *Erfahrung*. Drama begins with an imagined world. The creation of that world depends on the consensus of those involved in the process, the students and the teacher. The drama structures allow the students the opportunity to experience varied points of interest while on their imaginary expedition. One

intention is that imaginary experience will evoke an emotional response. The students become so engaged, either as participant or as audience (both positions are taken during drama), that they are involved emotionally. Neelands believes, "The emotional *experience* [*Erlebnis*] is real for the students even though the activity is fictional" (1992, p. 5). Within the imagined world, students explore "concepts, issues and problems central to the human condition" (J. Clark, 1997, p. 23) and in that exploration, physically and verbally express what they discover. The necessary assessment and reasoned judgment allow the situation to take on greater significance, incorporating critical thinking into the process (Farr Darling & Wright, 2004).

The following description, taken from a drama (a specific group of these activities) in my study, manifests a situation in which the critical imagination functioned in a drama class. The students entered the drama room. After they arranged themselves in a circle, I reminded them of their task. They had to decide if Jenu (Whitehead, 1992), the giant cannibal, should be allowed to stay with the community at their summer encampment. I then led them through a creative visualization that took them back to early times in Nova Scotia. Drums played in the background, welcoming them to the Mi'kmaq community. In my role as an elder, I asked community members, "What are your thoughts regarding Jenu and his staying with our community?" As the talking stick is passed around the circle, community members voice their opinions. "He should be allowed to stay. He has lived with one of our families for the winter and has not harmed them." "He will attract other Jenu to our community and put us all in danger." "He is a Jenu, he can never he trusted." "He has cared for us and protected us, please allow him to stay." The student playing

Jenu listened attentively as each person spoke. When his turn to speak came he stood, walked to the chief of the community and gave him a "*jipijka'm*, the horn of a Horned Serpent" (Whitehead, 1992, p. 47). "To show you I mean you no harm, I give you the horn of the *jipijka'm*, the only thing capable of killing me. If you ever worry that I will harm any member of the community, please use this horn to kill me."

In this drama the students were asked to imagine that they were part of a Mi'kmaq community at the time when Europeans first came to North America. Students in the class suspended belief in modern day to meet and discuss the dilemma that existed for the early Mi'kmaq community. They were then asked to consider a specific situation, a situation that had no obvious right answer and that could be described as requiring critical thinking. According to Robert Ennis, "Critical thinking is a process, the goal of which is to make reasonable decisions about what to believe and what to do" (1996, p. xvii). When the students were asked the question, "Should Jenu be forced to leave or should he be allowed to stay?" they were being asked to imagine and think critically at the same time. The students took seriously the question at hand, thought carefully about the implications of Jenu's staying, and offered their opinions to the community. Jenu challenged many of those beliefs with his offer of the *jipijka'm*. Community members began to change their opinions as the talk went round and round the circle. It was from this kind of drama experience that the term critical imagination evolved in my own mind.

Why should teachers provide such *Erfahrung* or imaginary journeys? The vision statement of APEF (1999), asked me to provide opportunities for students that

"will enable and encourage students to examine issues, respond critically and creatively, and make informed decisions as individuals and as citizens of Canada and of an increasingly interdependent world" (p. v). In the *Erfahrung* presented in the anecdote, students were given an opportunity to examine an issue, and having experienced the story of "Jenu" (Whitehead, 1992) through an imagined drama, were expected to respond to the question at hand in a critical and creative manner. Each student had to defend his or her position and had to try to convince the rest of the group to concur with him or her. Consensus was necessary as we replicated the decision-making process of the early Mi'kmaq people.

This method of stimulating the critical imagination, then, is a valuable pedagogic tool. The journeys provided by *Erfahrung* through dramatic structures gave students an opportunity to actively engage with the content of curriculum, to understand that social studies goes beyond facts, and to achieve the outcomes of provincial departments of education. More importantly, the students had the opportunity to feel *Erlebnis*, a life-influencing experience.

Sears (1997) suggests that such opportunities are rare in the lived classroom of social studies. Social studies continues to be seen primarily as a "not necessarily accurate body of facts" (Kincheloe, 2001). Often, the imaginary is ignored in school curricula, partly because of the principle that states educational development must begin with the concrete and progress to the abstract. This principle is "most clearly evident in social studies; we begin with the child and present concrete experiences, then focus on the family, then on to communities, working gradually outwards to the broader society and culture realms of the world" (Egan, 1989, p. 6). This type of

teaching supports the notion of social studies curriculum as content. Teaching in this manner does not fulfill the outcomes of curriculum guides. It fails our students by not encouraging them to become socially responsible participants in our society, or, in other words, good citizens (Osborne, 2000 Special Issue; Sears, 2004).

Citizenship Education

I. Wright (2003) examines the definitions of citizenship education and concludes that there are a myriad of definitions depending on one's perspective. He suggests that,

> There are tensions between definitions [of citizenship education] that focus on the individual and those that focus on the collective; there are tensions between those who wish strong forms of assimilation and those who wish to honour some form of independence for minorities in a multicultural society; and there are tensions between those who want to bring about global citizenship and those who believe that citizenship only makes sense in the context of a state or nation state.

Does one of the above descriptions of citizenship education appear in the Foundation document (1999)? Within the document there appear to be two views of citizenship—the first as an Essential Graduation Learning (p.6), the second as a strand in Key Stage Outcomes (p. 16). The Essential Graduation Learnings "describe expectations not in terms of school subjects but in terms of knowledge, skills and attitudes developed throughout the curriculum" (p. 5). In this light, social studies is viewed as citizenship education, education that provides students with opportunities to develop as "active and informed citizens in a pluralistic and democratic society"

(p. 6). As informed citizens, students develop an understanding of "the hybrid nature of their culture and the interdependent nature of our world" (p. 7). Citizenship education presented as such includes many of the issues that Wright describes rather than allowing for a single perspective. This interpretation of citizenship education takes an inclusive view, expressing the intent that students as citizens should not only be aware of their personal rights and responsibilities but also accept their global interconnectedness as citizens of the world. In order to accomplish that intent I suggest that in citizenship education teachers need to create *Erfahrung* for their students so that students can experience *Erlebnis.* To quote the Ancient Chinese proverb:

> I hear . . . I forget
>
> I see . . . and I remember
>
> I do . . . and I understand (Watson, 2007)

Drama Theorists and the Imagination

While it is not common for drama theorists to refer to the critical imagination or *Erlebnis*, support for incorporating drama into the curriculum can be found in various sources (Bolton, 1984, 1998; Booth, 1994; Greene, 1995; Neelands, 1992; Nussbaum, 1997; O'Neill, 1995; Renk, 1993; Somers, 1994; Wilhelm & Edmiston, 1998). Bolton believes that drama should be an integral part of the classroom because, "Dramatisation provides the means of arousing a keen desire to know"(1998, p.10). But the APEF (1999) vision statement requires more than knowing. It requires critical thinking manifested through critical and creative responses. Greene (1995) believes that through the stimulation of the imagination we

encourage children beyond the accession of knowledge. "Imagination is the one [means] that permits us to give credence to alternative realities. It allows us to break with the taken for granted, to set aside familiar distinctions and definitions" (p. 3). To ask students to participate in an *Erfahrung* is asking them to take risks, to expose their thoughts and feelings to others. In order to do this, students must feel safe and that no harm will come to them. They must feel accepted as an integral member of the community.

Community

In some ways, by simply being in the class, each student, by default, is a member of a community, but the kind of community developed in a class using drama is distinct. It is a community that requires trust, trust enough so that each student is a full participating member. As a full member, students "are in familiar territory . . . [they] are recognized as competent. [They] understand why they [other members] do what they do because [they] understand the enterprise to which participants are accountable" (Wenger, 1998, p. 152). Full membership is important because of the demands made by the use of the imagination. The imagined experience requires taking risks, exploring ideas freely without fear of reprisal or rejection. It is possible to establish such a foundation of trust through the use of dramatic games and exercises. However, as drama is not a linear process, the building of trust is a never-ending practice.

As the foundation of trust is being created, students begin to take imaginary expeditions, *Erfahrung*. During these expeditions, a new agreed upon landscape appears before the students. Within that landscape the students encounter a world

that belongs to someone else, but for a while, they allow it to become theirs. The beauty, the frustrations, the challenges, the life-styles, the tasks, the decisions, all face the students and each must decide how to behave under the circumstances. All "are able to take satisfaction in creating credible and coherent alternative worlds and experiences through their own imaginative efforts" (Neelands, 1992, p. 7). These forays into imagined worlds cultivate within the students the capacity that Marcus Aurelius called "sympathetic imagination" which, he suggested, "will enable us to comprehend the motives and choices of people different from ourselves, seeing them not as forbiddenly alien and other, but as sharing many problems and possibilities with us" (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 85). I use the term "critical" rather than "sympathetic" when referring to the imagination. I think that the word critical describes the type of imagination that Aurelius suggests but includes going beyond comprehending to acting while understanding the motives. Here have been planted the seeds of caring that along with interconnections, perspectivity and alternatives represents one of the four essential aspects of global education (Werner & Case, 1997).

Empathy and Imagination

Cognitive science offers support for the development of the capacity of empathy through the imagination. Thompson (2001) argues that ". . . the simulation-theory . . . [suggests] the ability to mentally 'simulate' another person. That is, on being able to use the resources of one's own mind to create a model of another person and thereby identify with him or her, projecting oneself imaginatively into his or her situation" (p. 11) develops empathy for the other. For example, Thompson suggests that there are four different kinds of empathy:

1. The passive association of my lived body with the lived body of the Other.

2. The imaginative transposal of myself to the place of the Other.

3. The interpretation or understanding of myself as an Other for you.

4. Ethical responsibility in the face of the Other. (p. 17)

Arendt (1968) also believes that, "the more people's standpoints I have in my mind while I am pondering a given issue, and the better I can imagine how I would feel and think if I were in their place, the stronger my capacity for representative thinking and the more valid my final conclusions, my opinion" (p. 241). Drama offers students the opportunity to develop each of these kinds of empathy and different perspectives when they "willingly suspend disbelief" (Coleridge, 1984, p. 169) in themselves and enter the Other's world to face the dilemmas of the Other. In doing so, students have an opportunity to "develop an understanding of their own and others' cultural heritage and cultural identity" (APEF, 1999, p. 6), an aspect of Citizenship. It is important to realise that the empathy developed through the dramatic experience is an interpretation of the Other's experience, not the actual experience of being the Other.

Support for using drama has been found not only in "drama literature" but in sources pertaining to social studies (Egan, 1989; Norris, 2001; Osborne, 1997; I. Wright, 1995). Osborne asserts that "the teaching strategies . . . that teachers employ can have direct consequences for citizenship" (1997, p. 59). Although Nussbaum does not mention drama specifically, she does state, "the arts play a vital role cultivating powers of imagination that are essential to citizenship" (1997, p. 85). The critical imagination is a key to developing citizenship, an integral part of the vision

statement of the APEF (1999). The support in the academic community for using drama to teach social studies is readily apparent but the question arises as to what is happening in the lived world of the classroom.

Current Use of Drama in Elementary Schools in Nova Scotia

Surveys by Hundert (1996) and Kaaland-Wells (1994) indicate that the use of drama pedagogy is not significant in classrooms they accessed for their studies, despite evidence which demonstrated that teachers continue to have a positive attitude toward drama. However, because these surveys were conducted in Washington state and Ontario, I felt it was important to discover if teachers in Nova Scotia, my home province, would report the same findings. In September of 2001, I sent Kaaland-Well's survey to 408 classroom teachers of grades P-8 from one regional school board in Nova Scotia. One hundred forty-nine surveys were returned to me. The results listed below, tended to support Kaaland-Wells' earlier conclusions:

- 26.3% of the respondents had taken a course in creative drama and 68.7% had been involved in in-servicing or a conference on drama
- 53.4% had read a book about drama and 70.1% had read an article
- 87.3% felt that drama courses should be available to pre-service teachers
- 91.5% wanted in-services made available at the district level
- 90.1% felt that drama is an effective means of presenting the curriculum
- 91.6% felt that their principal would support the use of drama in the curriculum
- 73.2% felt that parents would support the use of drama in the curriculum

Teachers had used the following dramatic forms successfully: dramatic play (57.3%), improvisation (85.5%), pantomime (34.9%), puppetry (62.4%), reader's theatre (62.6%), story dramatization (69.5%), and story telling (75.3%). With the exception of pantomime, over 80% of all respondents were interested in learning more about dramatic forms.

Despite these positive responses, only 3.5% of the respondents used drama daily or 21.9% weekly with their students; 25.5% used drama once a month and 43.9% used it several times a year; 4.9% never used it.

The reasons for not using drama included: lack of space (51%); a feeling that there was too much prescribed curriculum (41.4%); concerns that it was difficult to include all the children at all times (28.3%); fears that the children became too noisy (14.9%); a feeling that they, the teachers, did not have the knowledge (39.7%); and a belief that there were few drama related activities within prescribed texts (17.9%).

These findings suggested that there existed a very positive attitude toward drama and the potential it held for teaching across the curriculum. The greatest impediments included lack of space and too much prescribed curriculum. Initially, I had difficulty reconciling the responses regarding too much prescribed curriculum, especially since teachers felt there were drama activities within the prescribed texts. If there were drama activities within the prescribed texts, then how could there be too much prescribed curriculum that prevented the use of these activities? Although these activities may have been available, they were not necessarily in a format that would allow them to make up the greater part of the lesson or unit. Usually such

activities are presented as extension activities, ones teachers often do not make time for.

In terms of my project, the positive attitude of teachers was very encouraging. Their belief that drama was an effective method for teaching and their desire for greater knowledge suggested that I would find teachers willing to participate in the research project. The teachers in the survey also indicated that they were very interested in learning more about drama, suggesting that I had to be ready with theoretical and practical material to support their using drama to teach social studies.

Models of Drama: The Theory Behind the Models

Within the drama education field there are different models of drama that may be used, each having different strengths. I chose to use the methodology developed by Dorothy Heathcote (Bolton & Heathcote, 1995; 1991) and Augusto Boal (1979; 1992; 1995). Boal and Heathcote have developed their own methods and use different structures. However, they both incorporate dialectic methods (Heathcote et al., 1991) that allow, encourage and support the participant (in my case the student) to deconstruct the text, and to see both the good and the bad within a character. Through the deconstruction, Heathcote challenges the participants to delve deeper and look harder.

In educational terms, Cabral (1996) believes Heathcote continually expands what Vygotsky (1978) termed the "zone of proximal development (ZPD)." "It is the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through

problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). Tappan (1998) explains that,

> Vygotsky's conception of the ZPD clearly reflects the two foundational assumptions of his socio-cultural approach to human development: (1) the claim that higher mental functioning is mediated by words, language and forms of discourse which function as "psychological tools" that both facilitate and transform mental action; and (2) the claim that forms of higher mental functioning have their origins in social relations, as "intermental" processes between people are internalised to become "intramental" processes within persons. (p. 143)

Vygotsky's theory, which has been termed social constructivism (Davis & Sumara, 2002), recognizes that

> human cognition is something more diffuse, distributed, and collective. Put differently, social constructivists tend to frame subjectivity and objectivity not as two separate worlds . . . but as existing only in relation to one another. It is thus that the core concern of some branches of the discourse shift from the manner in which the individual constructs the world to the manner in which the world constructs the individual. (p.414)

Vygotsky's (1978) theory has influenced the paradigm of learning that I have developed over the last twenty years. That Heathcote's work reflects Vygotsky's theory supported my use of her methodology because it suggested that our beliefs

about how children learn were similar. One must adhere to the underlying tenets of a methodology in order to use the methodology effectively.

Heathcote develops "drama experiences from the materials of history, facts, documents, extracts from others' work" (Cabral, 1996, p. 215). Her work demands intervention from the participants. Through participation in a drama experience, the students create an understanding of the situation. The teacher does not impose a "correct" understanding but allows for different interpretations of the experience. It is through drama structures that the participants challenge those interpretations, which in turn require the students to question their beliefs, a criterion of critical thinking.

In Brazil, Boal, while developing his *Theatre of the Oppressed* (1979), worked extensively with Paulo Freire, another influential educational theorist. Freire's theory of *conscientization* (2000) "refers to learning to perceive social, political and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (p. 35). Using Freire's theory, Boal developed structures that challenged his audiences to participate in the theatrical process and at the same time spurred them to initiate political action. Under the umbrella of Theatre of the Oppressed are included *Image Theatre*, *Invisible Theatre* and *Forum Theatre*. Forum and Image Theatre have now become an integral part of drama classes in Nova Scotia (Nova Scotia, 1999). Boal's structures, like Heathcote's, challenge the participants to examine a problem from a variety of perspectives.

Drama Structures

I have chosen the term "structures" for a particular reason. Neither Boal nor Heathecote used the term structures to describe the activities in which they engaged. O'Neill, first introduced the term in her book *Drama Structures* (1982). I use the term structures, not in the modern architectural sense that implies a planned set of rules that are followed in order to achieve a predetermined goal, but rather as O'Neill uses the term, meaning structures that are more organic in nature, as in a biological perspective.

From biology, complexity theory has developed to describe the interactive nature of organic beings. Within complexity theory, a structure is a "complex web of events that contribute to an entity's current form. . . . Structures are matters of pattern and order, but not necessarily of deliberate invention" (Davis, 2005, p. 128). This definition depicts a structure within the drama classroom. The teacher uses a dramatic structure to allow students to engage with an issue but the teacher cannot predict, control or plan what the students will do within the structure. Although the teacher cannot predict, control or plan exactly how the students will react, the reaction is not random. The nature of the structure suggests the reactions will fall within certain parameters.

Heathcote's Structures

Heathcote (Heathcote et al., 1991) designed a variety of structures that can be used individually or collectively while creating a drama. These structures included roles, mantle of the expert, analogy, dance, simulation and games.

"*Roles*: where a person is the challenge" (Heathcote et al., 1991, p. 205). Roles could be used in two ways: by the teacher taking on a character or the children assuming a role of a character. Regardless of which method is used the children have an opportunity to examine, respond or confront that character's attitudes, values and behaviours. The character chosen allows the teacher to decide upon the focus of the discussion. If the teacher chooses to introduce *Hamlet*'s Ophelia as a participant in class, the experience would be vastly different from the teacher's selecting *Hamlet*'s Gertrude. Through the manipulation of the role, the teacher may "teach facts, challenge attitudes, pose questions, demand understanding, modify class behaviour" (p. 206).

"*Mantle of the expert*: where the class is set upon a task in such a way that they function as experts" (Heathcote et al., 1991, p. 205). The presentation of a problem and developing a solution to the problem is highly motivating for students. Students become willing to learn the necessary skills and to gather the necessary information in order to accomplish the task. The framework is established by the teacher but the rules within that framework are imposed by the profession of the expert, such as, for example, acting as an archeologist. As this structure can encompass the others (roles, analogy, dance, simulation and games) I provide a more in-depth description. Heathcote believes that if teachers want to stimulate student awareness of social issues, they do not create a drama about the subject at hand. "Mantle of the expert . . . works obliquely—learning about one thing by looking through something else" (Bolton & Heathcote, 1995, p. 27).

The best way to see how this oblique approach works is to use a specific issue. Bullying, for example, is a topic of great concern within the educational community today. We have seen an influx of programs such as *Expecting Respect* (Brunelle, 1999) and *The League of Peaceful Schools* (League of peaceful schools, 2000) used to educate both students and teachers about bullying and how to combat it. Programs such as Peer Mediation have been established to allow students to mediate between students, hoping to teach students the social skills needed to cope with adversity in a positive manner. These programs address the issue head on.

Heathcote (Bolton & Heathcote, 1995) on the other hand, in dealing with the problem of bullying, would design a drama about accommodating differences. She would create a legitimate task for the students by asking them to redesign an overcrowded office to accommodate a new worker with a physical disability; she would introduce the possibility of 'if' (if we could do this or if people would let us) to motivate the students; she would give the students the power to operate within an imaginary role; and, lastly, she would ask them to create a history, a present situation and to project a future. Through this drama, students as office workers might come to feel resentment that a newcomer is getting preferential treatment. Anger and frustration would mount. How does the management deal with the issue? How do they make everyone feel valued as an employee? How do they create an office community in which everyone is accepted and accommodated? While creating the past and the present of the situation, the students begin to recognize problems and are then given the opportunity to attempt to solve them as part of the projected future. As the students progress through the drama with direction provided by the teacher, they

begin to see how the situation relates to their own classroom. They begin to examine their own lives. Nussbaum states, "Socrates said that the unexamined life is not worth living for a human being. In other words, this life of questioning is not just somewhat useful; it is an indispensable part of a worthwhile life for any person and any citizen" (1997, p.21). It is through the drama and the expedition orchestrated by the teacher that students make the connections to their own lives and begin to develop Socratic questioning.

"*Analogy*: where one problem, a real one, is revealed by an exact parallel to it" (Heathcote et al., 1991, p. 205). This is a form in which the teacher must know exactly what aspect of the theme is to be explored, how to make the connection between the real and the analogy, and how to parallel the inner form rather than the story line. Analogy provides the opportunity to discuss old issues while looking through new glasses. As an example, Wilhelm's (1998) class was involved in the creation of a museum exhibit on Columbus entitled, "The Discovery of America." Wilhelm wanted to broaden his students' perspectives and so with the help of a student in the class developed an analogy. The student left her notebook and purse on her desk; Wilhelm took them, began to read the notebook and examine the contents of the purse. She protested as did the other students in the class, stating he was invading her privacy and stealing her possessions. Wilhelm countered with, "I found it. . . . How can this be stealing when you say that Columbus discovered America? " (p. 67).

"*Dance forms*: where the emphasis on non-verbal signals, experiences, and explanations are the means of discovery" (Heathcote et al., 1991, p. 205). Expressing

ideas and concepts through movement can be clearer than expression with words. Listening to what others see in the visual expression creates awareness within the creators of many possibilities of interpretation. Although those performing the movement may strive for clarity, the interpretation by others of the signs, which in this case are physical position or movement, may be quite different from what was intended. But the possibility always exists for a more provocative expression of the idea. I will explain more of this structure when I discuss Boal's Image Theatre.

"*Simulation*: where a simulation of life is made" (Heathcote et al., 1991, p. 205) or "holding the mirror up to nature" (p. 207). Through simulation, students are able to present part of their lives for interpretation. As the students work with thought and feeling simultaneously they are encouraged to make order of the chaos. Boal uses this idea throughout his work. Students can be asked to verbally or physically present an incident from their lives. Other students watch or listen and provide suggestions for modifications or explanations.

"*Games*: where the rules lead and control the play" (Heathcote et al., 1991, p. 205). Games are used to warm up the crowd. They establish the rules and, to be effective, should reflect the topic of the main event. For example, Keeper of the Keys, a game in which one person tries to steal the key from a blindfolded keeper, demonstrates how one individual tries to control the behaviour of another (Winston & Tandy, 1998). This game is a means of introducing a drama having a theme of conformity. The game creates for the students the framework of the drama. Consequently, teachers must know what the underlying point of the game is. If

games are not used judiciously, students will prefer to play games rather than participate in the drama, which is more demanding.

Boal's Structures

Although Boal's roots are in the theatre, and he uses theatre as an identifier of his structures, his structures are extremely important to drama in education and include aspects that are comparable to Heathcote's. In the 1970s, Boal developed the Theatre of the Oppressed (1979) including Image Theatre, Invisible Theatre and Forum Theatre. Although each is distinct from the others, at the same time each carries some of the same qualities. The decision about which theatre to use depends on the group, the circumstances and the desired outcome (Boal, 1992).

Image Theatre is based on the principle that verbal expression can cloud rather than reveal our true thoughts:

> Image Theatre is a series of exercises and games designed to uncover essential truths about societies and cultures without resort, in the first instance, to spoken language—though this may be added in the various 'dynamisations' of the images. The participants in Image Theatre make still images of their lives, feelings, experiences, oppressions. . . . [The] frozen image is simply the starting point for or prelude to the action, which is revealed in the dynamisation process, the bringing to life of the images and the discovery of whatever direction or intention is innate in them.
> (Boal, 1992, p.xix)

Boal uses the dynamisation or activation of the images created to reveal what lies beneath, often exposing thoughts, ideas, and beliefs of which the participants were unaware. Various arrangements of the images can create startling revelations.

Image Theatre works by taking an issue that could arise and creating an exercise around it. For example, due to the 1999 Marshall decision (Coates, 2000) of the Supreme Court of Canada, Native fishing rights have become an issue that impacts on many Nova Scotians. I would ask individual students to create a physical image of Native fishing rights. I would encourage them to explore their feelings, thoughts, and ideas about Native fishing rights. Some students may create an image of a Native, some a non-native. Each student who wished to create an image would do so in what Boal (1995) terms the *aesthetic space*. The aesthetic space is where we choose to practice drama. It is not an assigned space such as a stage; it is any space in which we choose to perform.

Those who have chosen to be the audience are not an audience in the traditional sense; they are *spect-actors*. Boal coined the word to describe "a member of the audience who takes part in the action in any way; a spect-actor is an active spectator" (1992, p. xxiv). The spect-actors would describe what they see in each image as it takes centre stage. If any spect-actors feel there is another image that could be represented, they may create that image. This would continue until all representations had been explored. For the first dynamisation or activation, the image makers are asked to recreate their images all at the same time, juxtaposed randomly against each other. The result of the dynamisation is that Native fishing rights are not seen as individual images, but become a social image. The image makers may also

be asked to speak, each describing his or her feelings which the image is expressing. Again the spect-actors describe what they see in terms of attitudes and desires, trying to discern all the different aspects of the whole image. What the spect-actors see will reflect many different perspectives, often recognizing ideas that the image makers were completely unaware were represented. For the second dynamisation, the image makers are asked to link their images to another. The important aspect is the interrelationship between the images. This allows the images to group themselves in themes within the social image. What becomes apparent is an "organised, organic, social image" (Boal, 1992, p. 166). All factions within the whole may have an opportunity to speak and express what they are feeling. Again the spect-actors describe what they see. For the third and final dynamisation, the image makers are asked to take on the opposite of the image they have created. Frequently, the images created demonstrate the effect of the issue, in this case Native fishing rights. The image that is now desired is the cause. For example, if the first image is that of a fisher expressing anger (effect), then the opposite image would show who or what is inducing the anger (cause). The image makers could also be given the opportunity to speak. It is important to discuss at great length the images presented and what they represent. It is also imperative to note that a solution is not being sought, only a discussion of what is presented. The students may discover that as they try to shape the opposite image, they do not have enough information to present that perspective. Students may reveal their biases when asked to present the opposite image. The teacher should recognize those biases or the lack of information and make available

resources that include various perspectives of the issue, including all participants within the society.

When introducing a topic, the teacher cannot know what images will be represented; therefore, it is important to encourage the students to create many perspectives of the topic, perhaps by naming the different people (First Nations, fishers, non-native, government) who have a stake in the topic. Boal (1992) uses the term *the joker* to describe the role the teacher takes as "the director, referee, facilitator and workshop leader" (p. xxiv). As the joker, the teacher is ever encouraging but never forceful. "What else do you see?" is continually asked. In the discussion following each dynamisation, it is legitimate for the joker to present what she sees in the image but should carefully choose when to speak in order to refrain from directing the conversation. This is only one of many techniques within image theatre. The methods described offer new possibilities in the understanding of issues because of the expectations placed on the students. Students are asked to physicalize, emote and speak while others describe what they see and infer.

Invisible theatre is "public theatre which involves the public as participants in the action without their knowing it" (Boal, 1992, p. xx). A situation is performed in a public place and the public may choose to become involved in the performance. To illustrate, I return to the example I used for Heathcote's (Heathcote et al., 1991) analogy. When Wilhelm's class was involved in the creation of a museum exhibit on Columbus entitled, "The Discovery of America," Wilhelm, with the aid of a student, developed a short piece that he termed an analogy. Wilhelm is correct when he states this is the analogy structure but it was performed using Invisible Theatre. The

student pretended to be affronted when Wilhelm took her notebook and purse but she, in fact, knew exactly what Wilhelm was doing while the other members of the class did not. It was the *invisible* aspect that motivated the students to be part of the discussion and forcefully made the point of the analogy. However, there is a great deal of controversy about the ethical use of Invisible Theatre and therefore its use should be approached with caution.

"Forum Theatre is a theatrical game in which a problem is shown in an unsolved form, to which the audience . . . is invited to suggest and enact solutions. The problem is always the symptom of an oppression and generally involves visible oppressors and a protagonist who is oppressed" (Boal,1992, p. xxi). The game could also be described as a scene, and the symptom of oppression as a problem. For example, although the oppression of a systemic racist society is a reality, it is a daily representation such as name calling in the racist society that Forum Theatre deals with. A group of students who had been exposed to name calling would create a scene around that issue. The scene would be presented without a resolution. The role of the spect-actor is to try to find a resolution to the situation by taking on one of the roles in the scene and modifying the behaviour of that character in some way. Other spect-actors try different modifications. Resolutions may or may not be reached. It is the diverse attempts that are important.

A common element of all of these structures is the use of improvisation. According to the *Oxford Encyclopedia of Theatre and Performance* improvisation is "Unscripted acting in which the performers collectively make up the story or situation as they go" (Barnes & Kennedy, 2003). Students may be given time to

develop and to compose but frequently without writing anything down. A written script is not a required part of the outcome. When given the opportunity to present the improvisation, the dialogue may change but the intent stays the same. In different circumstances the students may be asked, as in Forum Theatre, to present without preparation.

Social Studies, Moral Education and Drama

In the examples used to demonstrate Heathcote's (Heathcote et al, 1991) and Boal's (1992) dramatic structures, the students' values and beliefs were exposed. Values are an integral part of social studies (P. Clark, 2004; I. Wright, 1995) but remain hidden in the textbooks or didactic teaching methods unless challenged through provocative activities. Drama can provide those provocative activities. Osborne (1997) and I. Wright (Farr Darling & Wright, 2004; 1995) believe that social studies cannot be taught without including values. I. Wright's (1995) definition of values includes "things that are deemed to be of significant worth in a person's life. They guide and influence behaviour" (p. 198-199). I. Wright agrees that values go beyond preferences. The individual must be strongly committed for it to be a value. Wright further states that values are expressed in a variety of way—simple, comparative and prescriptive. Values fall into two categories, prudential (self-regarding) and moral (other regarding). I suggest that values, both prudential and moral, are an integral aspect of citizenship education, which includes students being aware of their personal rights and responsibilities but also accepting their global interconnectedness as citizens of the world. The APEF Social Studies Foundation (1999) document recognizes that attitudes and values are an integral part

of social studies curriculum (p. 14). Although values and attitudes are not specifically identified in Key Stage Outcomes, they are alluded to when outcomes state that students are expected to "demonstrate an understanding of [and] . . . give examples of the influence of freedom, equality, human dignity, [and] justice" (p. 16). Students are also expected to " explain why cultures meet human needs and wants in diverse ways; describe how perspectives influence the ways in which experiences are interpreted; discuss why and how stereotyping, discrimination and pressures to conform can emerge and how they affect an individual" (p. 18). The teacher is expected to present curriculum that encourages students to develop tolerance and acceptance of differences, to develop qualities within children that would help them to be contributing, empathetic, socially aware members of society or, in other words, good citizens.

Values education, ethical education and moral education, I would argue, are similar. They involve an examination of the beliefs that guide a person's behaviour. Winston (1997) has been a strong supporter of moral education using drama as its primary pedagogical tool. Edmiston (2000) supports ethical education through drama. Winston (1997) exposed me to MacIntyre's perspective on the teaching of virtue, another name for a similar idea. MacIntyre (1981) proposes the neo-Aristotelian tradition. He suggests that the study of virtue should be as a reflection of self rather than a universal perspective, asking the question, "What sort of person am I to become?" (p. 118). Edmiston (2000) favours Bakhtinian philosophy. Edmiston maintains that "Bakhtin's concept of 'outsideness' emphasizes that we must get outside our individual intention in order to view and evaluate our action from the

viewpoint of those affected. Concern for the type of person we might become can only be in relation to how others would or might relate to such a person" (p. 65). Edmiston argues that in drama students are asked to assume roles other than their own. This allows students through imagination "to evaluate actions from the positions of those affected by the consequences of our actions" (p. 66).

I feel that by using Heathcote's (Heathcote et al., 1991) and Boal's (1992) structures I can provide opportunities for students to both question what kind of person they are to become as well as to develop an understanding of other's perspectives. Through understanding another's perspective, students may begin to question what sort of persons they are and will become.

Heathcote's (Heathcote et al., 1991) and Boal's (1992) structures respond to the expectations of moral or values education by asking students to examine their values and to understand different perspectives. Winston and Edmiston both support my decision to use the structures of Heathcote and Boal in citizenship education. Winston (1997) believes that Boal uses dialectic action to create opportunities to make audiences think. Boal does not propose that there exist right or correct answers, but that the audience or spect-actor should explore the action and many possible solutions. Edmiston (2000) recognizes that Heathcote's "mantle of the expert" allows students the opportunity to explore "what it would mean to act in the world as an ethical person" (p. 67).

In addition, included in the description of the dramatic structures are examples of how drama encourages students to question their beliefs and challenge what they take for granted. Edmiston believes that "Drama can create powerful

dialogic spaces in which students' 'ethical imagination' changes their moral understandings in making their views more multifaceted, interwoven and complex" (Wilhelm & Edmiston, 1998, p. 61).

Obviously if I hoped to allow for the possibility for challenging students' values and views, I must provide opportunities for that to take place. I have described the pedagogical tools to be used and the curriculum area to be addressed but I have yet to describe specifically the means of creating the *Erfahrung*.

Storytelling

One possibility for linking the disciplines of drama and social studies came in the writings of Kieran Egan (1989). Egan believes that we need to use the imagination of children, building on what they already do well, rather than trying to fit them into "a logico-mathematical thinking model" (p. 21). He designed a model that demonstrates to teachers how to use story in order to teach any subject matter. Egan's model is important because it provides teachers with a support structure for creating curriculum. Used in conjunction with Heathcote's or Boal's techniques, it has great possibilities. The use of storytelling finds support in what has been described as values, ethical or moral education.

MacIntyre (1981) asserts, "It is because we all live out narratives in our lives and because we understand our own lives in terms of the narratives that we live out that the form of narrative is appropriate for understanding the actions of others" (p.212). Storytelling is the means by which people express their thoughts and beliefs. MacIntyre (1981) goes further to state that these stories aspire to truth. I would

concur but would add that it is the truth of the person telling the story. If we are to learn about others and their reality, their stories are an appropriate place to begin.

Using drama to explore these stories provided the students with the opportunity to become the other. It also gave the students, if we choose our stories and drama structures well, the opportunity to consider dialectic action. Dialectic action, named by Beckerman (Winston, 1997), is action that presents two perspectives within the same character, such as both the good and the evil. Shakespeare's character, Macbeth, is frequently used as an example to demonstrate this type of action for although Macbeth's actions were morally unacceptable, his vulnerability was also revealed. Some dramas focus on iconic action, which "celebrates and confirms audience values by concentrating and embodying social values and images, its point being to prove what the audience already knows" (p.67). My goal, however, was to move students beyond what they already know.

In Egan's (1989) storytelling model, he suggests that identifying the "binary opposites" (p. 41) is essential, but he feels that in the conclusion the binary opposites must be mediated and resolved (p. 59). Students must be afforded the opportunity to experience the different perspectives and come to some resolution. I. Wright (1995) feels that in order to foster understanding and acceptance, the need is to recognize the differences, and through experience with the other's perspective, come to recognize the similarities. Edmiston (2000) refers to this as the ethical imagination, the ability to imagine what it is like to be and act like someone else. The ethical imagination may allow for the understanding of culture and diversity and world view to develop.

Winston (1997) uses traditional fairy tales in addition to other literature. Edmiston (Wilhelm & Edmiston, 1998) and others (Clandinin & Connelly, 1990; Greene, 1996; Johnston, 2001; Sills-Briegel & Camp, 2000; Suh & Traiger, 1999; Waters, 1999) also support the use of literature in social studies. Reading *Obasan* (1994) by Joy Kogawa, who chronicles the stories of Japanese Canadians interned during WWII, before discussing compensation for the Japanese Canadians could provide background knowledge necessary for critical thinking. Exploring traditional stories of First Nations people allows the students to gain understanding of their culture and beliefs. But it is the use of dramatic structures in conjunction with the stories that serves to deepen the experience for the students beyond the acquisition of information.

In summary, I have attempted in this chapter to support the decisions I made regarding the identified problems and my proposed solution. I have explored those elements of the scholarly literature of critical imagination, citizenship education, drama education and moral education that provide theoretical support for the direction of my study. I searched for commonalities among the proponents of social studies, drama and moral education to demonstrate the value in merging the distinct fields of social studies and drama. From my perspective, the grounds for doing so was evident and now the means of merging these fields must be explored.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLGY

In this chapter I describe the many facets of educational action research, why I chose to use socially critical action research in this study, the ways in which my research employed the characteristics of socially critical action research and how I fulfilled its characteristics. As an introduction to the study itself, I describe the drama units that I used in the research, how I collected data and finally how I analysed that data.

Educational Action Research

In order to effectively investigate the research questions that guided this study, I searched for a research method that would support the goals of the research project, which included engaging teachers in using drama as a pedagogical tool, creating moral dilemmas for students to struggle with, and fulfilling the vision statement of the APEF document for social studies. Action research appeared to meet the demands. Stringer (1996), among others (Atweh, Kemmis, & Weeks, 1998; Greenwood & Levin, 1998; Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005), describes the common characteristics of action research. They

1. are rigorously empirical and reflective (or interpretive);
2. engage people who have traditionally been called "subject" as active participants in the research process; and
3. result in some practical outcome related to the lives or work of the participants (p. xvi).

The third characteristic includes the notion of self-improvement. Richardson and Judah (2002) concur with this description but note that action research has extended beyond the implied ultimate answers of self improvement to "provide teachers with a way to situate their professional and personal identities within layered and complex communities of practice in which they, themselves, are complicit, and over which they do not have to assume the paralyzing responsibility of complete control" (p. 4).

Participatory action research as described by Kemmis and McTaggart (2005) aims to provide a vehicle for institutional and individual change in two specific ways. First, a concrete practice must underpin the research. Practical educational problems must be addressed. In this regard, I identified two problems: teachers were not teaching social studies in a manner which satisfied the vision of the APEF (1999); teachers felt that drama was an effective means to engage with curriculum, but did not incorporate it into their teaching on a regular basis. The first of these problems was identified through literature (Kincheloe, 2001; Sears, 1997) generally depicting the teaching of social studies both in Canada and the United States. The second was supported by literature (Hundert, 1996; Kaaland-Wells, 1994) and confirmed by a survey (Spence-Campbell, 2001) that I conducted.

Secondly, "Participatory action research offers an opportunity to create forums in which people can join one another as co-participants in the struggle to remake the practices in which they interact" (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005, p. 563). It was the teachers who came together during the research project who re-made the practice while they were directly involved in the research study. The practice was not externally developed by the researcher and then imposed upon the practitioners.

Although the subject matter and the methodology had been decided upon, the teachers chose the curriculum, deciding what stories and which drama structures would effectively contribute to student understanding.

Participatory action research (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005) begins with the identification of a problem and then involves a cycle of planning, acting, observing and reflecting. It has traditionally been called a spiral or cycle but Simmt (2001) prefers to call it a fractal. The term fractal has been used to describe a "new geometry" within complexity science (Davis, 2005). Simmt (2001) introduced the term fractal when referring to the process that occurs within action research. Simmt feels that the action research process of planning, acting, observing and reflecting should not be viewed as a series of steps to be followed but as integrated descriptors of the whole process. A fractal is an object which when a piece is broken off from the whole continues to reflect the whole, or is scale independent (Davis, 2005). Although the teacher plans various lessons, he or she is taking into consideration past actions, observations and reflections while planning. The planning cannot be isolated from acting, observing or reflecting. Tripp (1990) concurs with the fractal analogy. He notes, "different moments [of action research] contain aspects of all the other moments within themselves" (p.160). From Tripp's description, each section contains aspects of the whole project within that section. We cannot and neither should we attempt to compartmentalize when we are planning or acting or observing or reflecting. Both action research (Davis & Sumara, 2005; Phelps & Hase, 2002) and drama pedagogy (Laidlaw, 2000; D. Wright, 2000) can be described by this complex term. As stated previously, drama is a non-linear process of negotiation of

meaning. Students do not plan, act, observe and reflect, each step following the next. Concurrently students plan and act as they observe and reflect. As the two methodologies can be described as such, I suggest that the use of action research methodology and the use of drama methodology compliment each other, supported by the use of action research by other drama researchers (Edmiston, 1996; Heaney, 1999; O'Toole & Burton, 2005; Taylor, 1996).

Types of Action Research

Within the action research field, Tripp (1990) identifies three types of action research—technical, practical and socially critical. Grundy (1988) identifies the same three types of action research but uses the term emancipatory action research where Tripp uses the term socially critical action research. Although they use similar terminology, Grundy looks at the various types of action research in a manner different from Tripp. To Grundy the control of power within the project is one means of denoting the type of action research being done. According to Grundy, technical research involves a single individual, the facilitator, controlling the project (p. 355). An individual comes up with an idea and involves others in the project. Belief in the project is not necessary for participation. Tripp, on the other hand, believes that technical action research is about the what and the how (1990, p. 160). In other words, what is it I feel needs improving or changing and how can I achieve that goal? For example, if I think that marking with a red pen affects how students feel about their work, how can I find out if it does and does the use of other colours affect how they think about their work?

For Grundy, in practical action research, power is shared among a group of equal participants. Those participants are interested in developing practice that "furthers 'the good' of the students" (p. 356). Tripp's description of practical action research focuses on the what and the why (p. 160). What is the change I want to make and why is the problem occurring? For example, within a combined grade 5/6, there is a certain animosity among the students. If I want to eliminate the animosity (the what), in order to do so I must understand the underlying reason or reasons behind the behaviour (the why).

What Tripp (1990) refers to as socially critical action research, Grundy (1988) names it as emancipatory action research and Kemmis (2005) calls it "critical participatory" action research. Tripp states that it must be emancipatory, address social injustices and go beyond change for improvement (p. 161). For Grundy, it must include, "theory", "enlightenment" and "action" (p. 358). Kemmis notes seven key features, including "collaboration", "emancipation", "practice" and "critical consciousness" (p. 567). How does socially critical action research differ from technical and practical action research? According to Tripp, it goes beyond the how and the why of technical and practical research but includes both. The status quo of culture and society must be questioned. For Grundy, the power "resides wholly with the group, not with the facilitator and not with the individuals within the group" (1988, p. 363); the purpose of the research is to free the participants from "the dictates of compulsions of tradition, precedent, habit, coercion" (p. 358). To use Tripp's (1990) example of the students' being required to raise their hand before speaking in the classroom, it asks the question: Who established the rules of

protocol? Why do children have to speak in turn? Why do they have to be recognized before being allowed to speak? *Robert's Rules of Order* (Robert & Vixman, 1984) may play a role, or did our culture play a role in creating those rules? Which came first, the spoken rules or the unspoken rules? Can we or should we go about changing those rules which have been established by our culture? The goal of socially critical action research is to do just that, to empower its participants to recognize embedded power relationships and act to challenge and change the status quo.

Teachers examine their practice through reflection on a regular basis. When a problem exists within the classroom, the teacher usually goes about finding a solution for it. But it does not constitute action research unless the teacher uses a formalized means to examine the experience by participating in the research fractal. The teacher must first identify a problem or a need. For example, a teacher may want to include curricular outcomes from different subject areas in a single unit of study. Prior actions, observations and reflections mold the planning while incorporating diverse outcomes. While the teacher enacts the plan, he or she is continually making personal observations. However, for action research, observations must be formally recorded in some manner, such as written field notes or videotaping. Artifacts and student-generated work are collected for close examination. Although student work is usually evaluated by the teacher, the reflection in action research takes on a different bent. The teacher is no longer solely evaluating the student's learning in relation to the outcomes but is also looking for ways to improve or modify his or her practice. Field notes describe in great detail what transpired in the teaching situation.

Videotapes provide the teacher with a visual transcription of the lesson. Videotapes capture images and sounds that the teacher cannot see. They provide an in-depth opportunity for the teacher to reflect on the lesson, and provide more information that has implications for lesson planning. But that reflection does not take place in isolation. The planning, acting and observing all influence the reflection. Within all action research there must be a research fractal of planning, acting, observing and reflecting. Finally, findings must be formally presented or published. As well, questions must be addressed publicly. For example, is it possible to effectively integrate curricular outcomes from different subject areas?

Choosing Socially Critical Action Research

In deciding which type of action research best met the needs of this project, I compared the proposed project with the descriptors of each type of action research. I hoped to find a means to help teachers to grow beyond the hegemonic teaching of social studies to be able to provide a more inclusive perspective of Canada and the world. Teachers have a responsibility to provide students with an experience of social studies as it is described in the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999) rather than through the dominant cultural view of most texts (Kincheloe, 2001; Sears & Wright, 1997). The APEF document describes social studies in the following way:

> This curriculum is designed to help each learner construct a blend of personal, academic, pluralistic, and global perspectives. Social studies helps students construct a personal perspective as they consider the implications of events and issues for themselves, their families, and their communities.

> Students contract an academic perspective through the study and application of the social studies disciplines. Students construct a pluralistic perspective as they respect diversity of identity, beliefs, and practices and incorporate diverse points of view into their understanding of issues. Students contract a global perspective as they seek equitable, sustainable, and peaceful solutions to issues that confront our culturally diverse world. (p.2)

In highlighting the need for students to "respect diversity of identity, beliefs and practices" and to search for "equitable" solutions to global problems, these aims appeared to fit Tripp's (1990) description of socially critical action research in that they were emancipatory, addressed social injustices and went beyond change for improvement.

As I indicated in Chapter One, I believed that one way of achieving the outcomes of the social studies curriculum was through the use of drama within the curriculum. I believe that teachers can be supported through PD experiences so that they can "turn their often theoretical reflections into action in the material world" (Tripp, 1990, p.161). I hoped to find like-minded individuals who recognized the need for pedagogical change in our social studies classrooms. With a group for support (Edwards & Payne, 1994; Fullan, 1993), I hoped that participants would take the theoretical reflections to which Tripp (1990) refers, and develop them into what Grundy (1988) terms "critical intent" (p. 358). It is critical intent that is the impetus behind the enlightenment and the action. Through discussion of theoretical reflections, I hoped teachers would find the support needed to turn the reflections into intent. With the critical intent and the presentation of theory, the participants

would become enlightened to the possibilities of the pedagogical use of drama, which spur action and so the fractal is created.

Kemmis (2005) feels that critical participatory (emancipatory or community-based) action research provides the structure for social and intellectual changes to take place. These social and intellectual changes could include the changes in attitude and thinking that Boal's *Theatre of the Oppressed* (1979) and Heathcote's (Heathcote et al., 1991) structures promote. Tripp (1990) states that socially critical action research must include two aspects of criticism: a view that society is unjust and secondly that the idea of justice and equality be examined (p.161). I have already noted that the texts used in most social studies classes reflect the views of the dominant culture, in most cases, a white European male perspective (Sears, 1997). Ironically, that stance is unjust not only to those who are not members of the dominant culture but also to those who are. All people deserve the opportunity to see our country and the world from a variety of perspectives.

Regarding the second of Tripp's requirements, I returned to the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999) which identifies both justice and equality among other ethical issues to be recognized and examined by students in developing the concept of citizenship (p. 16). Socially critical action research was well suited to this outcome.

Tripp (1990) defined five characteristics which needed to be taken into consideration when undertaking socially critical action research: participation, direction, consciousness, constraints and outcomes. I will briefly reflect on these

characteristics in relation to the complex ways in which each played itself out in my research:

Participation: I needed a group of teachers whose beliefs and expectations echoed mine. These included the belief that drama was an effective means through which educators can engage students with curriculum, and that the social studies curriculum was an important aspect of elementary schooling. I had the data to support the belief that drama "is an effective means of presenting the curriculum" (Kaaland-Wells, 1994). In the survey (Spence-Campbell, 2001) distributed among 408 eight elementary and middle school teachers in a school board in Nova Scotia, an overwhelming 90.1% of the 149 respondents agreed that drama was an effective means to engage students with curriculum.

Direction: Tripp (1990) maintains that those involved in a research project must care about it. It is an aspect of what Grundy (1988) terms critical intent. She states, "Critical intent is the disposition which motivates action and interaction at all stages of emancipatory action research" (p. 358). I explained to the teachers what the project entailed. They were given the opportunity to ask for clarification. After deliberating, they approached me about joining the project. Each teacher indicated that being involved was important not only to themselves but to the students in their classes. I believe that a critical intent existed in the teachers as well as me as we embarked on the research project.

Consciousness: Consciousness, according to Tripp (1990), is one's world view, including values, aspirations, ideology and habits. Freire (2000) goes further than that and writes that *conscientização* "refers to learning to perceive social,

political and economic contradictions and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (p. 35). Part of my role as facilitator was to present theory that described the material often used in our schools. Although the teachers held values which allowed for a more inclusive perspective, they at times did not recognize the perpetuation of the hegemony. Grundy (1988) and Tripp (1990) recognize the importance of exposure to theory within the research process and I made this a priority in my own research project.

Constraints: Constraints are always in existence. In my project, external constraints could have included space but did not. Disturbing others with too much noise was another issue. I solved this problem by using a room with only my classroom adjoining it.

Access to teachers and their classrooms was an obstacle I had not anticipated. Individual school boards in Nova Scotia have differing criteria for allowing researchers into their schools. One school board denied me access and therefore prevented teachers from participating in the project. I was given no reason for the decision despite my requests for clarification.

In Nova Scotia there is a government initiative to increase standardized testing in mathematics and language arts and to publish individual school results. Teachers felt pressure to produce good results and therefore spent time allocated for Social studies and science trying to improve their students' performance in mathematics or language arts. The teachers did not expressly state this position but demonstrated it by their behaviour in the classroom and their discussion in the staff

room regarding the lack of time to get everything done and how they had to sacrifice some subject areas for the sake of others.

Various aspects of time became the most stringent constraints in my research project. Initially I asked that teachers be willing to commit to a two-year research project, which included teaching social studies twice a week. Participants were expected to keep field notes and to post these notes on a WebCT. In retrospect, I was asking far too much of teachers. A two-year commitment was excessive and consequently I had only one teacher, Lily, agree to participate.

In addition to the long-term time constraint, the practicality of fulfilling a short-term time commitment was another issue. Because of other school demands, Lily and I found the twice-weekly time commitment difficult to fulfill.

I overcame the long-term time commitment constraint in the third year of the study when, in the spirit of the evolving nature of action research, I made changes to the study which allowed teachers to act as observers of my teaching. However, this created another time constraint. In the revised study, teachers and their students would be involved for a period of six consecutive classes. The question arose as to whether action research could be accomplished within that time frame. I think it is reasonable to suggest that authentic methodological change would not be possible. In order to accomplish an "authentic methodological paradigm shift" (J. Wilkinson, personal communication, May 2002) three to five years may be required. But I felt that having more teachers and students involved in the project was important. I hoped that in future years I would be able to continue to work with teachers.

There were also internal constraints on the research project, such as the need to include teachers who were risk takers with high energy. Teaching drama requires a great deal of energy. I found teachers much more willing to allow me to do the teaching rather than to do it themselves. Both the energy level and the risk taking were factors in that decision.

Outcomes: The outcomes of socially critical action research should "develop new practices, rather than modify existing ones" (Tripp, 1990, p. 163). None of the teachers involved in the project had used drama as a pedagogical tool before participating in the project. Consequently, they did develop new practices. As a result of the project, all of the teachers used drama to some extent in their own classrooms. Subject areas included not only social studies but language arts, science and mathematics.

Research Participants

In February of 2003, I sent an invitation to twenty-nine schools within my school district, explaining my research project and inviting any primary (kindergarten) to grade six teacher to become a part of it. I received one response, from a teacher in my school. I expanded my search for participants by issuing invitations at conferences. I contacted principals in other districts whom I knew were interested in an arts-infused program.

I searched for many reasons as to why teachers would not be interested in being involved in such a project, especially after I had received such positive feedback in my survey. An important reason became clear through one respondent's remarks: "I totally 'strongly disagree' that classroom teachers get in-serviced yet

again on something that is best taught and delivered [by a teacher] with a "large" level of expertise. Enough already has been downloaded to the classroom teacher!!" (Spence-Campbell, 2001). Typically, elementary teachers are expected to be experts in everything they teach. This teacher expressed her frustration at greater and greater expectations being placed on her and her inability to cope with yet another demand, despite being very positive about the use of drama in teaching. Consequently, I spent two years working with one teacher, Lily, from my own school. I feel that practical action research was completed here, rather than socially critical action research. Having only one participant did not seem to fulfill the criteria for creating social and cultural changes that are required of socially critical action research.

In year three, I decided to make a change that increased the number of teachers who were willing to participate and the range of classes and the age of the children involved. I invited any teachers in my school who wanted their students to participate in drama classes to be included in the project. The invitation was two-fold. Classes could participate and their teachers not participate or classes could participate and teachers could act as observers of their students while I taught the classes. Each class was to have six consecutive drama sessions that would encompass one unit. The teachers and I would choose the unit from several presented to them. Ten teachers wanted their classes to be part of the project but only three teachers initially agreed to be observers. I applied and received a short-term study leave of twelve days from the Professional Development Committee of my school board. This leave gave me release time from my own class so that I could teach the other classes.

The situation regarding my research project in my school changed after a conversation with staff members. After school, while drinking tea in the staff room, June, a grade three teacher whose class would be participating, asked me if any teachers had agreed to participate as observers. When I responded positively, she said, "Oh, the young ones." I replied that young teachers were interested but also that Joyce, a grade two teacher close to retirement, wanted to participate. June was surprised because she knew that Joyce did not like to use computers and the impression was that computers were involved in the project. I had set up a WebCT site through the University of Alberta to use with teacher participants in my project but it did not prove to be a useful tool. My original thought was that teachers from around the province would be able to use the WebCT as a place to post their research journals. Because it eliminated distance among teachers, it would allow for teachers from all over the province to become involved.

I explained to June that when Joyce approached me about participating and not wanting to use computers, I told her that she didn't have to. Immediately, four of the five teachers sitting around the table agreed to participate. I had not realized that computers would be such a deterrent to being part of the project. Once the use of computers was eliminated, nine of the ten teachers agreed to participate as observers. Having this number of teachers meant that socially critical action research was possible.

The Role of the Researcher: Participant, Teacher, Facilitator

During the course of the three years of gathering research data, I assumed the three distinct roles of participant, teacher and facilitator. During the first two years,

this was especially intense because Lily and I were the whole project and I felt obligated to gather as much data as possible. In different ways, the third year was more strenuous because of the number of teacher participants I was facilitating.

In year one of the project, I worked with my class, beginning to collect data in February, 2003. I taught social studies using drama as a pedagogical tool twice a week. In September 2002, I had begun a drama in which my class created a "city-state" (fashioned loosely after the Greek city-states). The class had created a government that dealt with the daily life of the class. I collected data from this city-state drama only after I received ethics approval and consent from parents and guardians. The students had consented to be part of the city-state drama at the beginning of the school year.

Although I was working with one other teacher, Lily, she initially spent most of the time observing my work with both of our classes. We met once a week for one hour. My grade six class and her grade one class worked together as drama buddies. This gave Lily the opportunity to understand how to conduct a drama unit with her class. The longer we worked together, the more confident Lily felt and she began to work with her class in between our joint sessions. Before beginning a drama unit, we discussed the types of issues we were interested in presenting to our classes and how best we could work together. By the end of year one, she took on the responsibility of working with her class separately. I was able to visit her class on three occasions and observe her while she worked with the students. For these three occasions, Lily developed a drama based on the fairy tale "Jack and the Bean Stalk." I played the

role of facilitator in this instance as I provided Lily with theoretical material that helped to support her development of the drama.

In year two, I continued to work with both Lily's class and mine. Similar structures were used. Lily and I joined our classes for drama buddies and I continued to teach my class social studies twice weekly incorporating several dramas as well as the year-long drama of the city-state. I realized during that year that teaching social studies twice weekly was resulting in a very fragmented experience both for me and my students. Much repetition was needed to refresh the students' memories of the experiences. Consequently, I made a major change in the structure of the dramas toward the end of the year and continued with the change in the following year. I taught social studies as a whole unit every day until the drama was finished. This change meant that social studies was not taught every week; often it was taught only once every six weeks but the dramas themselves lasted from six to ten days.

In year three, with many more participants, my role as facilitator expanded. Before the drama sessions began I met with the teachers from each grade level. Because of their lack of drama experience, the teachers looked to me to present them with ideas of how to fulfill the outcomes established in the APEF Social Studies Foundation document(1999). Consequently, after the teachers decided which outcomes would be addressed, I looked for material that I felt would suit the teachers' intentions. I presented to the teachers several ideas for dramas that could explore a number of the identified social studies outcomes. We discussed which one they felt was most suitable for their classes. Although they were given the option of choosing different dramas, each grade level decided to use the same material. For

those teachers who were participating as observers, I gave them material on how to keep an observation journal. I gave the teachers two options as well. While observing the class, each teacher could choose to focus on the behaviour of one student or could watch the class as a whole. Although only one teacher chose to single out one particular student, most of the teachers made comments within their journals about individual students who were exceptional in their eyes.

I continued to teach social studies to my class with the aforementioned changes in place. Social studies was taught in block units until the topic was completed. Most units lasted approximately two weeks.

Drama Units

When looking for drama units to present in my class and to offer to other teachers, I searched for and developed dramas that fulfilled my criteria. The dramas had to include structures from either Heathcote (Heathcote et al., 1991) or Boal (1992). They had to involve story, and a moral dilemma on a topic from the social studies curriculum. For the most part, I found published drama units in literature from England, Dorothy Heathcote's home.

The question arises as to why I chose to use published dramas when neither Heathcote nor Boal did. My rationale was multi-dimensional. The first requirement of the sessions was that they fulfill outcomes of the social studies curriculum. To that end, Heathcote (Wagner, 1999b) understood that when a teacher chooses a particular subject area, "you don't begin by asking the students what they want to do a play about" (p. 38). The teachers in this case chose which outcomes and topics they wanted their classes to investigate. Heathcote, herself, introduced topics as she saw

fit. "I recently introduced a class of infant children to the Goddess Pele. . . . I wanted to make a double thrust about learning about volcanoes . . . " (Heathcote et al., 1991, p. 91).

Secondly, the teachers with whom I was working were novices. They had little experience in using drama to teach. Although I was teaching the class, I wanted the teachers to feel comfortable with the process and to believe that they too could use this pedagogical tool with their students. Heathcote (Wagner, 1999b) recognizes that some teachers may need to "keep a higher proportion of the decisions in their own hands" (p. 27). The published dramas allowed the teachers to know in advance the dramatic structures that I would be using and the directions in which the drama could go. The dramas also included a description of each structure used so that the teachers could become familiar with them.

Thirdly, I had developed dramas for my own class, using Heathcotian structures. To do this well is a time consuming task. I was working with several classes at one time and felt that I needed to have good quality dramas for each class. I did not feel that I had the necessary time to develop dramas for the teachers to follow.

Lastly, the dramas that I found had been developed by researcher-practitioners who had been influenced by Heathcote and who continued to implement her beliefs about what drama can and should accomplish. These dramas were not developed as prescriptive lock-step recipes but as frameworks from which to work. Situations were developed in order to help the students to develop belief in

the drama. Students were presented with dilemmas in which they had to make the decisions and deal with the consequences of those decisions.

Importantly, these dramas offered teachers a guide as to how to use drama. They were not a recipe to be followed exactly, but, rather, were suggestions of how to engage the students into discovering what they already knew, "a framework within which they negotiate their change, their interaction" (Heathcote et al., 1991, p. 115).

I feel that drama researchers have developed these dramas to extend Heathcote's influence. They offer support to teachers while they are "edging in" (Wagner, 1999b, p. 26) to using drama. Heathcote (Heathcote et al., 1991) believes that "You should not feel guilty about what you can or cannot do; it's not a question of what you should do but where you stand and what your thresholds are" (p. 27).

My use of Boal's (1992) structures was as a complementary means to further explore characters and their motivations within the drama rather than as a primary tool to develop a drama. An example of this comes from the drama, "The Highwayman Comes Riding" (Flemming, 2000). Using Image Theatre, I asked the children to express with their body a frozen image of an emotion that they had recognized in one of the three main characters, Bess, Tim and the Highwayman. I chose those who had created duplicate emotions to be the audience. We discussed the emotions in the characters represented by the students. I asked if they felt any had been left out and if so they could add them. Images of each of the characters were created in the same manner. I extended the activity by asking the students to create an interactive tableau with two of the characters to demonstrate the relationship between them. Again the students had the opportunity to discuss these

relationships and the differences between them, and to add emotions or to reshape them. In doing so the students developed a understanding of many of the characters' emotions and therefore the motivations behind their actions.

I found published dramas in a variety of sources: *Key Shakespeare: English and Drama Activities for Teaching Shakespeare to 10 – 14 Year Olds* (Ackroyd, 1998), *Drama Lessons for Five to Eleven-Year-Olds* (Ackroyd & Boulton, 2001), *LiteracyAlive! Drama Projects for Literacy Learning* (Ackroyd, 2000), *Teaching Literacy through Drama* (Baldwin & Fleming, 2002), *Lessons for the Living* (J. Clark, 1997), *Drama Structures* (O'Neill & Lambert, 1982), *Beyond the Beanstalk: Interdisciplinary Learning through Storytelling* (Rubright, 1996), *Drama and traditional story for the early years* (Toye & Prendiville, 2000), *Drama, Narrative and Moral Education* (Winston, 1997), *Beginning Drama 4 – 11* (Winston & Tandy, 1998), *Drama Literacy and Moral Education 5 – 11* (Winston, 2000a). I also developed dramas myself, "Scambell City," "In the Earliest of Times," *Night John* (Paulsen, 1993) and "Black Loyalists."

Most of the dramas found in the above texts needed modification. In order to be able to do this, teachers need experience in using drama structures. Consequently, I made the modifications drawing on my experience. Some did not include enough background information, some presumed too much on the part of the students. As most of the dramas were used more than once, the action research fractal allowed me to make modifications that suited my teaching style and the needs and interests of the classes involved. The action research fractal also allowed me to modify the dramas from day to day. An example of this modification occurred in the drama "The

Gargoyles Creep" (Winston, 2000b). Both the classroom teachers and I noted after one lesson that the students had not been engaged in the movement activities that day. They had been flitting about the classroom but had not believed in what they were doing. The teachers and I discussed the problem and how we would go about solving it. We decided that we needed to slow the activity down, giving the students more time to become involved in each movement word. When I implemented this change the next day, the students reacted with belief in what they were doing.

The moral dilemmas presented to the older students were true dilemmas in the sense that there was no clear right or wrong answer. This stimulated the students to think through the dilemma and come to decisions without pressure to do the pre-conceived or conventionally right thing. The students had to weigh the circumstances and to decide what was most important to them. It allowed them to truly engage in critical and creative thinking. In the dramas used for the younger students, I found some of the moral dilemmas proposed had a right and a wrong choice. Often I felt that I was leading the students to make what I thought to be the right decision. I was bothered by this because I wanted the students to reason out their decisions for themselves. But at the same time, I wondered if younger students needed more concrete options. There were some exceptions. The trial of Jack in "Jack and the Giant" gave the students opportunities to be both creative and critical in their opinions.

Data Collection

In year one, data was collected from my class from the following dramas: "Scambell City", "Sweet Clara and the Freedom Quilt" (Winston, 2000a), and "Macbeth" (Winston, 2000a).

"Scambell City" was a year-long drama in which the students created a city-state. Data included all artifacts from the city-state and other dramas, including minutes from weekly meetings, currency which had been created, newspapers, election speeches, and students' thoughts about the drama. Various sections were videotaped. I kept a research journal for all sessions. My original plan in keeping a research journal had been to write after school regarding the session that had taken place that day, but I found that usually this was impossible. Meetings, parents, bureaucratic dealings and marking took up most of my after school hours. The uninterrupted time necessary to record and reflect on what had happened was available only on the weekend. Consequently, most of my research journal was written at that time. The elapsed time between the doing and the writing allowed greater opportunity to reflect on what had happened. I must acknowledge, however, that what the students actually said may have been modified during the time lapse, with the exception of those sessions for which I had videotape. However, I believe I was able to maintain the intent of what the students said.

Data was collected from a joint drama, "The Gargoyles Creep" (Winston, 2000b), with grade six and grade one. Artifacts, which included any student generated work, videotapes, and photographs, were collected. Lily and I kept a research journal about the process. Data was also collected from a unit, "Jack and the

Giant" (Winston, 1997), developed by Lily. I observed her class on three occasions, keeping a research journal of the experience. I videotaped all three sessions. There were no artifacts collected nor any field notes from Lily. We did discuss the drama in detail and I have notes from those conversations.

Year two proved to be a difficult year for data collection from my observations of Lily's class. Lily and I continued to work together with our classes as drama buddies. Two dramas, "Queen of Hearts" (Baldwin, 1991) and "Jill and the Giant" (Toye & Prendiville, 2000) were undertaken with her students. I worked with the students for the most part. I kept a research journal on the experiences. Lily did some drama work in her classroom but I have no field notes from her. I had asked Lily to keep a journal but I did not receive one from her because, like me, it was difficult for her to find the time required to write. As she did not have the vested interest in the project that I had, the keeping of a research journal was not as significant to her as it was to me. However, she continued to use drama as a pedagogical tool to teach social studies and we still discussed the project.
The times we had set up to observe did not work out for various extenuating reasons. In my classroom I collected data from "A Highwayman Comes Riding" (Flemming, 2000), "In the Earliest of Times," "Romeo and Juliet" (Ackroyd, 1998), "Squirms" and "Windsor City-State." Data took the form of a research journal, artifacts including any student generated work, videotaping, and photographs.

In year three I worked with eleven classes from grades P, 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6, including my own. The chart below indicates which dramas were taught at which Grade level:

Grade Primary	"Jill and the Giant" (Toye & Prendiville, 2000) "The Queen of Hearts" (Baldwin & Fleming, 2002)
Grade One	"The Sun Wizard" (Ackroyd & Boulton, 2001),
Grade Two	"Frog and Toad's Garden" (Rubright, 1996) "Tinker Jim" (Winston, 2000a),
Grade Three	"The Gargoyles Creep" (Winston, 2000b),
Grade Five	"Land Tax" (Ackroyd & Boulton, 2001),
Grade Six	"A Highwayman Comes Riding" (Flemming, 2000) *The Giver* (Lowry, 1994) "In the Earliest of Times" *Night John* (Paulsen, 1993)

Nine of the teachers involved in the project participated as observers. I collected observer notes from seven of them. I wrote research logs for each and collected artifacts, including any student generated work from all classes and some videotapes.

Action Research Fractal

Within the action research fractal of planning, acting, observing and reflecting, I found that two distinct fractals appeared. One fractal took place on a daily session basis and the other on a unit basis. In the midst of teaching, when things did not work as well as I felt they should have, I continually reflected on the planning, acting and observing, making changes in the process to improve the next day's lesson. With "The Highwayman" (Flemming, 2000), for example, I found that

the follow-up activities Flemming described presumed too much on the part of the students. I needed to add details to the lessons in order to improve the quality of the experience for the students. In year three, having two classes participating in the same lessons allowed me to implement changes from one class to another.

I also looked at the unit as a whole and made changes in how I would approach the unit the following year. An example is the change I made in the time frame format of the dramas. I had originally taught social studies twice a week but at the end of year two I began to teach in large blocks of time. I decided to use the block format with the teaching of the other grades in year three due to the disjointed experience I had had with my own class. In the younger grades, units of study do not tend to be as segregated. Lily had integrated her social studies and language arts curricula and had already begun to teach in blocks. For me, this decision was made at the end of year one. The time format was a matter for discussion in year three when the new participants and I discussed how we would go about structuring the study. They agreed that using blocks of time would be more productive than having lessons twice weekly. Consequently when applying for a study leave to work with other classes in that year, I requested two blocks of six days each.

Data Analysis

My primary research question asks if the use of drama as a pedagogical tool could encourage teachers to teach social studies. In order to answer the question, I had to first demonstrate to the teachers that the pedagogical tool that I would have them use was capable of achieving results. I used the term results not as a mark indicating a pass or fail but rather an indication as to what extent the outcomes of the

APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999) were achieved. In analysing the data from the students, I was able to demonstrate how outcomes were achieved. The teachers/observers were not a formal part of the analysis of the student data. Their interpretation of the project came from taking field notes, which supported my analysis, and having the opportunity to observe their classes during the drama sessions. Through their observations they realized the potential of using drama as a pedagogical tool and were encouraged to incorporate drama techniques into their classroom practice. Using our field notes and conversations, I examined how the participation in the research project changed our practice.

To examine and analyse the students' involvement in the project, I turned to the raw data collected from the drama sessions. It was obvious the volumes of data needed to be condensed into a manageable form. After much searching and reading, it became apparent that scripts (Ely, 1997; Saldaña, 1999) were a natural manner in which to display the data. In every drama unit the students performed, in a manner of speaking. I was able to see how the critical incidents that occurred would be best represented in a dramatic form. I wrote the scripts to represent the students' work based on my field notes, videotapes, observer notes and artifacts. Some are recreated from field notes and artifacts, others are edited transcripts from videotapes. Both types of scripts can be viewed as partially fictionalized accounts (Conrad, 2004). Recognizing that all interpretive work is subjective (Clandinin & Connolly 1994), I have tried to remain true to the intent of the children and the teacher.

I must also acknowledge subjectivity in choosing which dramas and segments to script. For the most part, these are my interpretations of critical

incidents. But in the case of my teaching classes other than my own, my interpretation was often supported by the observer's notes or comments. The observer's notes never disagreed with my interpretation but may not necessarily have referred specifically to the incident I described.

Throughout all of the dramas, I noticed the theme of belief or "the willing suspension of disbelief" (Coleridge, 1984, p. 169) emerged. In creating the scripts, I was also able to identify themes (Denzin, 2002; Ely, 1997) that appeared in data. Other themes emerged, but I identified four themes that were consistently manifested in the data collected from different grade levels and years:

1. The use of power and authority
2. Developing and supporting opinion
3. Showing kindness
4. Accepting responsibility

From the recreated or transcribed scripts, I examined the degree to which the students' actions in class matched the identified theme. I then examined the script in relation to my research sub-questions noted in Chapter One:

a) In what ways does drama enable students to make informed decisions about issues in Social studies.?

b) In what ways does drama enable students to develop creative responses in the examination of issues with Social studies?

c) In what ways does drama promote the development of ethical judgment in students?

a) In what ways can drama provide for the development of the critical imagination in citizenship education?

Trustworthiness

Triangulation (Creswell, 1998) is a process by which qualitative researchers can feel that the findings of their research have a sense of trustworthiness. Denzin (Janesick, 2000) identified four types of triangulation: data triangulation in which various sources of data are collected, investigator triangulation in which different researchers are used within a study, theory triangulation in which different theories are used to evaluate data and methodological triangulation in which a variety of methods are used within a single study. I have used data triangulation to afford a sense of trustworthiness in the findings of this study. The data for this research project were collected over a period of three years. In those three years, raw data were collected from three distinct sources:

1. My teaching in my grade six classroom over a period of three years
2. Lily's teaching in her grade one classroom over a period of two years
3. My teaching in ten classes in my school ranging from grade P to 6 over a period of one year

From these different sources of data, and using a combination of research journal entries, field notes, videotapes, observer notes and scripts, I discovered similar findings, which I believe afford an acceptable level of trustworthiness.

To provide another measure of trustworthiness, I asked the teacher participants to review my findings. Each was provided with a copy of my findings to

read and comment upon. The comments I have received indicate an agreement with my interpretation of the events.

Ethical Considerations

Throughout my research project, I have ensured that I have followed the guidelines of the Research Ethics Board of the Faculties of Education and Extension at the University of Alberta. All participants were provided with information regarding their rights and signed a consent form. To ensure confidentiality, all names used in the dissertation are pseudonyms. At no time do I mention the name of my school or the school jurisdiction in which I teach. Only my supervisor, the teacher participants and I have had access to raw data. The participants had access to the raw data only as it was produced during the drama session. All data has been stored in a locked cabinet.

Not all parents gave consent for their children to participate in the research project. I ensured that no data, including writing, photographs or videos, were collected from those children. To my knowledge in no way did their lack of participation affect my dealings with either the child or the parents.

In summary, in this chapter I have attempted to describe the methodology of action research used in the project and the rationale behind using socially critical action research. I have explained the roles that I and the other participants played and described how data was collected and analysed. Finally, I have attempted to demonstrate the trustworthiness of the findings of the project and the ethical considerations I bore in mind to ensure the quality of the research and the protection of the participants.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE DATA

IT'S ALL IN THE PLAY

The dramas described in the study had two primary goals: first, to fulfill key outcomes of the social studies curriculum, and, secondly, to challenge the students with a moral dilemma, a predicament in which the students had the opportunity to make decisions and/or to find solutions. The dilemmas presented to the students might be thought of as perturbations: "all those interactions that trigger changes of state" (Maturana & Varela, 1992, p. 98). Maturana and Varela, introduced the term to describe the impetus behind adaptations of living structures. I am co-opting the term to describe the problem that confronted students and that encouraged them to examine the situation. Through that critical examination and consequent critical thinking, the students may have modified or changed beliefs or opinions.

The dramas ranged in length from six to ten days. To provide a better context for the research, in this chapter I present excerpts from the dramas, I indicate in which of the three years they took place and who was teaching each particular drama. Although the teachers and I consulted each other on the initial outcomes we wanted to achieve, and what dramas we felt could achieve them, in fact the students became the driving force behind what took place.

In what follows, I present excerpts from the dramas written as scripts (Ely, 1997; Saldaña, 2003), analyse them by identifying emergent themes and interpret how each script reflects a specific theme in an attempt to communicate what I

understand to be the intent of the students (Denzin, 2002; Ely, 1997). I then reflect on how the dramas relate to the research sub-questions (Wellington, 2000) I posed.

I created the scripts from my watching videos, reading field notes and examining artifacts. Some of the scripts are verbatim transcripts with minor editing while others are recreations of the situation. As each script is presented, I indicate which category it falls into. From the scripts, I identified four specific themes:

1. using power and authority

2. developing and supporting opinion

3. showing kindness

4. accepting responsibility

As I mapped the different dramas with the emerging themes, in an attempt to visually represent my data, I realized that what appeared before me was an intertwined web—a web that wove its way among grade levels, dramas and years. As I proceeded with my analysis, a complex picture of the research manifested itself in my attempt to make sense of the data I had gathered.

Due to the multi-faceted nature of the themes and the scripts, I cannot use a single script to demonstrate a specific theme. More than one theme manifests itself in each drama. However, for greater clarity, in this chapter I organize the scripts according to individual themes. Unfortunately, this demands some repetition and consequently I return to some scripts more than once as I examine how they demonstrate another theme.

I examine in detail two of the four themes: the use of power and authority and how opinions are formed and justified. I chose to examine these two themes in depth because I think that the vision statement of the APEF (1999) and the notion of citizenship hinges on them. I will briefly touch on the other themes.

These scripts could be analysed from a variety of social relations perspectives but I focus on their relationship to the research sub-questions (Wellington, 2000), which were developed from the vision statement of the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999):

a) In what ways does drama enable students to make informed decisions about issues in Social studies.?

b) In what ways does drama enable students to develop creative responses in the examination of issues with Social studies?

c) In what ways does drama promote the development of ethical judgment in students?

d) In what ways can drama provide for the development of the critical imagination in citizenship education?

In addition, because an impetus behind the research was to demonstrate how the outcomes of the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999) could be fulfilled, I make direct reference to how these dramas achieved outcomes within various strands. Although the outcomes referred to are those of the Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation, that does not preclude their relevance to curriculum in other provinces. As stated in Chapter One, the APEF document is comparable to

those developed by other provinces (Sears, 1997; Shields & Ramsay, 2004; Wright, 1995). Consequently, my findings are relevant to all elementary teachers in Canada.

Theme 1

The Use of Power and Authority: Who's Got the Power?

As examples of the theme "Who's got the Power?", I present two dramas which represent different situations:

Year One: Lily, my co-researcher, is teaching grade one with *Jack and the Bean Stalk* (Winston, 1997).

Year Three: I am teaching grade two with *Tinker Jim* (Winston, 2000a).

Jack and the Bean Stalk

Lily developed and presented the drama *Jack and the Bean Stalk* to her grade one class using Winston's book (1997) to guide her. The children had read many versions of *Jack and the Bean Stalk* and Lily led them through a variety of drama activities that deepened their understanding of the story. As a culminating activity she decided that she, using teacher-in-role as the giant, would take Jack to court for stealing. The students, as the villagers, were given the task of deciding how things would be sorted out.

In the context of the story, it was somewhat out of character for the giant to go to the villagers asking them what should happen with the harp, the gold and the hen. He had always been a character with power, someone to be feared. Despite that, the students had no difficulty taking on the task. This was so for a variety of reasons.

The complex nature of drama had empowered the students. The teacher had demonstrated in Heathcotian fashion (1991) that "individual contributions [would be] valued and respected" (p. 51). The students were accustomed to being asked to take on different roles. They knew that they as students had input into what happened in a drama, that there was not a correct outcome (Heathcote et al., 1991). Despite their young age, they understood the authority of a court and the role that they as jurors could play.

In this transcribed, but edited, script, the court was not set up as a recognizable courtroom. There were no lawyers, nor was there a judge. This was a people's court in which the students, as villagers, were invited to express their opinion as to whether or not Jack should have to return the goods he stole from the giant.

Setting: The people's court in Jack's village.

The people are gathered in the court to hear the giant ask that Jack be penalized for stealing his hen, his gold and his harp.

Giant: I have brought Jack here today to be charged with stealing. I want you to decide if I should get my stuff back. I want it back. He stole from me.

Many villagers raise their hands in an attempt to be recognized.

Villager 1: I think you should share with him.

Giant: Share! Share! Why should I share? He didn't ask. He just came and took my stuff.

Villager 2: But you would have eaten him.

Giant: Well I admit that I might have eaten him but …

Villager 3: Well that was his father's stuff.

Giant: His father's stuff? *(turns to Jack who is sitting beside him)* Was that your father's stuff?

Jack: Yes.

Giant: How do you know?

Jack: 'Cause I saw him with it.

Giant: How do you know? That hen could have been any hen. How could you tell? Gold is gold.

Jack: The colour of the hen, and the gold was in a special spot.

Giant: (*recognizing a girl with her hand up)* What do you think, tasty little, I mean nice little girl?

Villager 4: I think Jack should go to jail!

Giant: I'm with you. I think Jack should go to jail.

Many villagers interrupt and call out: NO! You should go to jail.

Giant: *(addressing villager 4)* Why do you think that?

Villager 4: He stole from you.

Villager 5: *(interrupting)* No you should go to jail. You stole that stuff from his father.

Giant: Do you have any proof of that, Mr. Know-it-all boy?

Villager 5: There's a picture of his father and him with the hen, the gold and the harp.

Giant: I would like to see that picture.

Many villagers call out. No. You would rip it up.

Jack produces a book with a picture of his father. The giant holds up the picture and scoffs.

Giant: *(dismissively)* He says this is a picture of his father. I don't see any gold. *(coaxingly)* What do you think intelligent little boy?

Villager 6: I think you should go to jail!

Giant: *(gruffly)* I've changed my opinion of you. Why should I go to jail?

Villager 6: You stole his stuff. He had proof it was his.

Giant: Hang on, I can prove it was my stuff. *Holds up a different book.* Look here. Does it say here that I stole the gold? It just shows a dense little boy who took some magic beans and climbed up the bean stalk and stole my stuff. If he hadn't found those magic beans he never would have found the gold. What do you think?

Villager 7: You stole those things.

Several villagers get up and go and get proof (books) to back up their opinion.

Giant: *(Hopefully)* There's new evidence that's being presented. Let's listen to the new evidence.

Villager 8: Look, see here. It says, "Here's the giant that killed your father."

Giant: What? What? Read that again.

Jack: You killed my father?

Villager 9: You killed Jack's father?

Villager 8: *(reading)* Here's the giant that killed your father.

Giant: It does say that but I have more evidence. (*He turns to the front cover of the book)* See here, it is about Kate and the Bean Stalk. Is your name Kate? HA! I rest my case.

Villager 4: I've changed my mind. I think you should go to jail.

Later in the trial

Villager 3: I have evidence. Look here. *(shows the giant a book)* You killed his father.

Giant: When?

Villager 3: See he's crying

Giant: Oh! Who was crying? Jack? Oh, that does look bad for me.

All the villagers shout at the same time against the giant.

Giant: Order in the court!

Giant: Now if I let you keep the gold and the noisy harp will you give me back my hen?

Jack: I'll give you back two eggs.

Giant: I don't care about the eggs. You can have all the eggs. I just want my hen. I love her so. My heart is broken.

In all the books that the students had read, the giant had the power. He ruled over the villagers, taxing them and forcing them to comply with his edicts. On first glance it appears that when he came to the court asking the villagers to decide what happened to the items that he gave power over to the people. But, although he ostensibly asked the villagers to decide what should happen, he continued to demand that they comply with his request to have Jack return his things, continuing to all the while imposing his authority and power. He took charge from the beginning of the scene, recognizing different villagers and asking them their opinion. He also controlled the trial because in fact he was the teacher who used her role as the giant to manage the class' behaviour. The students raised their hands in attempts to speak. The giant (teacher) recognized individual villagers, asking them their opinion.

Despite the fact that the giant was the authority, the villagers had no qualms about questioning him and, therefore, his power. Often the students called out, not waiting for the required recognition from the teacher. Villager after villager stated that it was the giant who had wronged Jack. They did not deny that Jack stole the hen, the gold and the harp but they rationalized the stealing as Jack's recovering what belonged to his father.

The villagers were aware of the danger of the giant, as shown in the statement, "You might have eaten him." Not only might he have eaten Jack but also he intimated that he might eat them as he intimidated a villager with the question, "What do you think, tasty little, I mean, nice little girl?" Also, the villagers did not

trust him. They suggested that they could not bring forward the real evidence because the giant might rip it up, destroying it. At this point in time, the villagers did not believe that the giant recognized their power.

The giant tried to sway another villager's opinion by suggesting he was intelligent before the villager had a chance to speak. When the villager voiced his disapproval of the giant, the giant quickly changed his opinion and his tone of voice.

The villagers continued to try to exert power by bringing evidence to prove that the giant had stolen the goods to begin with. As an interesting aside here, George Cruikshank, a British illustrator, "found Jack's theft of the giant's treasures morally reprehensible and felt obliged to rewrite the story, turning the robbery into a re-appropriation of the dead father's fortune" (Tatar, 2002, p. xiv). For a time, the giant refused to acknowledge the villagers opinions and, in effect, their power. He also refused to accept any solution that did not entail Jack's returning the gold, the harp and the hen. He refused to accept any of the evidence brought against him until very damaging evidence was brought forth. Not until a villager found an illustration of Jack crying did the giant accept any responsibility for the problem.

Immediately after realizing that the villagers had caught him, the giant's tone changed. His voice, demeanour and words demonstrated that he was willing to negotiate, thereby, acknowledging that the villagers did indeed have power. He was no longer demanding, but, rather, open to suggestions from the villagers. At this point, the giant seemed willing to accept that the opinions of the villagers carried weight. The transfer of power had begun to take place.

Research Sub-questions

In this instance, I refer to the research sub-questions that ask how drama enabled students to make informed decisions; how it promoted the use of ethical judgment; how it encouraged students to develop creative responses; and how it allowed students to demonstrate critical imagination.

The villagers challenged the giant, refusing to be bullied or coerced by him. As they challenged him, they supported their opinions with evidence. The villagers understood that in order to convince the giant that their opinions were legitimate and that they had power to express and support them, they had to supply evidence. They found substantiating evidence in several of the available books in the classroom. The decisions the students had made while forming their opinions were well thought out and supported with evidence.

In calling into question the authority of the giant, the villagers demonstrated their ethical judgment (Edmiston, 2000; Wagner, 1999a). They refused to accept what the authority deemed was reasonable. Despite the giant's on-going attempts to find someone who would support his demands, the villagers continually returned to the fact that there was ample evidence to suggest that the giant had stolen the items in question. They did not deny that Jack stole from the giant but they considered stealing a reasonable manner in which to regain what was rightfully his.

In assuming some power, Villager 1 offered a different and creative solution to the dilemma. He refused to submit to the giant's demands but suggested that Jack and the giant should share the hen, the harp and the gold, thereby benefiting both.

This resolution did not place blame or fault at one or the other's feet either, but acknowledged that both may be implicated in the crime. The giant dismissed the suggestion, immediately countering that he should not have to share because Jack never asked him to share.

The students demonstrated their critical imagination in their role as citizens. The students were actively engaged in the imaginary situation (Neelands, 1992; Wilhelm & Edmiston, 1998). They were thinking critically in challenging the giant. They had accepted their role as citizens in examining the evidence. They were prepared to take action and made decisions based on what they felt was appropriate. They were not afraid to question authority when they deemed it necessary.

Outcomes of the APEF

In this script, the students had an opportunity to participate in an activity which allowed them to experience many of the key outcomes of "Citizenship, Governance and Power" (APEF, 1999), including:

To identify examples of their rights and responsibilities as citizens

To demonstrate an understanding of equality, human dignity and justice

To recognize laws that influence their personal lives

To recognize power and authority in their lives

To demonstrate that groups and individuals can influence decision making

To recognize that individuals and groups have different perspectives on public issues

To take age-appropriate actions to demonstrate their responsibilities as citizens (p. 16.)

The APEF suggests that these outcomes be achieved by the end of grade three. Clearly, from the data, grade one students are capable of meeting these outcomes. In underestimating the ability of grade one students to fulfill these outcomes the APEF may well be operating according to Egan's notion (1989) that most social studies curriculum creates lock-step progressions that have pre-set notions of when children are capable of more abstract, critical thinking. In this imaginary and abstract trial, these students demonstrated that they are quite capable of reasoning, finding supporting evidence, accepting civic responsibilities and expressing their rationale. But I would also suggest that the pedagogical tools that the teacher used greatly influenced the ability of the students. The use of drama as a pedagogical tool may not be the only means that a teacher can use to encourage students to think critically and abstractly, but, as the evidence shows, it is certainly an effective one.

Tinker Jim

Tinker Jim (Winston, 2000a), a drama that I used with grade two students, explored the plight of a homeless man who had taken to begging for food. The three main characters involved are Tinker Jim, the beggar, Reverend Delves, the pastor of the local church and Lady Higg, a parishioner of Reverend Delves' church.

Tinker Jim went to Reverend Delves' home because he saw a poster offering to help those in need. Tinker Jim was given a tin of cat food. Because Tinker Jim was given a tin of cat food to eat, he delivers a letter, written in conjunction with the

students, to Reverend Delves suggesting that a tin of cat food was not an appropriate food item to give a person. After I introduced Lady Higg, a well-to-do character in the drama, I asked students in small groups to consider the situation from Lady Higg's point of view and to decide whether or not they would give Tinker Jim food if he came begging at their door. Once the students had had the opportunity to make their decision, I asked for a student volunteer to play Lady Higg. In the recreated script of the improvised scene that follows, Stephanie offered to play Lady Higg when Reverend Delves, whom I play, came to visit.

Setting: The sitting room of Cudeleigh Towers, the home of Lady Millicent Mulberry Higg

Lady Higg: Do have some tea, Reverend.

Reverend Delves: Thank you. Don't mind if I do.

Servant enters the sitting room.

Servant: Excuse me, Ma'am. That man has come back. What should I do?

Lady Higg: Find something for him to eat.

Reverend Delves: Lady Higg, are you offering food to Tinker Jim? He's been begging all over town. I would advise you not to.

Lady Higg: Why ever not?

Reverend Delves: He's an ungrateful sort. Why, I offered him food and he refused it.

Lady Higg: I find that hard to believe. He's always been very grateful to me. Why would he refuse food?

Reverend Delves: He wrote me a nasty letter, rejecting the can of cat food that I offered him. Beggars can't be choosers. In fact, he was quite rude to me. The nerve of him addressing me, a man of the cloth, in such a manner. I am telling all my parishioners not to give him a bite! A man begging, it's a disgrace! He should go out and find a job.

Lady Higg: Well, Reverend, I don't think that was very Christian of you. I am shocked at your behaviour. How dare you offer a man a can of cat food? I would expect you to be nicer. Good bye, sir!

In this scene, the power initially appeared to reside with the minister. Reverend Delves felt it was his duty to advise Lady Higg that she should not give handouts. He was in her home but felt he should comment on how she was behaving. However, Lady Higg questioned the authority of Reverend Delves, the minister of her church, thereby assuming a position of power herself. She refused to accept his advice not to give handouts to begging men and she reprimanded him for his lack of Christian behaviour. Secondly, we must remember that I, the teacher, was playing the reverend. So, in this case, the questioning of authority was not only the woman's questioning her minister but also in some respects, a student questioning a teacher. Both as the teacher and as the reverend, I was quite taken aback at Stephanie's vehemence. She was not prepared to compromise on her principles and had no difficulty telling the reverend that she did not agree with his behaviour. Not only did she not agree with it but also she would not condone it or have him in her house. Her classroom teacher was also surprised at Stephanie's role playing for it was quite out

of character from her regular classroom behaviour. She was generally a quiet, accepting child who never questioned or challenged the teacher in any way.

Research Sub-questions

I consider the role that three of the sub-questions posed in the study: in what ways did drama enable students to make informed decisions; in what ways did drama promote the development of ethical judgment in students; and in what ways can drama provide for the development of the critical imagination?

While questioning authority and assuming power, Lady Higg made an informed decision. She neither accepted Reverend Delves' opinion and judged Tinker Jim immediately nor rejected his opinion out-of-hand, but instead asked the reverend for more information on two occasions. As Lady Higg, Stephanie asked why she should not give food to the man and then asked for further clarification when told that Tinker Jim had refused food. When she realized that Tinker Jim had refused a can of cat food, she recognized that Reverend Delves had degraded the man by offering him cat food and, in essence, told him that he was not good enough to be offered people food. It was not until she had this additional information that she made her decision to send the reverend away. In sending Reverend Delves away, Lady Higg demonstrated her control of power within the situation.

Stephanie used ethical judgment in sending Reverend Delves away and in choosing to give Tinker Jim food. She had to make a decision as to whether or not she would help another individual and whether or not she would follow the advice of the church. She may have felt pulled between these two options asking herself the question, "Do I listen to my heart or follow the advice of my pastor?" In the end she

felt she could neither follow Reverend Delves' advice nor condone his behaviour. In fact, she rejected both his advice and his behaviour by throwing him out of her house. She demonstrated that she felt Tinker Jim and his plight were more important than the beliefs and advice of Reverend Delves.

In assuming power, this student also demonstrated the use of her critical imagination. Through her actions, she expressed Ennis' (1996) definition of critical thinking: "Critical thinking is a process, the goal of which is to make reasonable decisions about what to believe and what to do" (p. xvii) but in an imaginary situation. In this imaginary situation, Stephanie as Lady Higg was confronted by her minister who told her that she should not help a man in need. She thought carefully about this situation and weighed the options but in the end decided to go against the advice of Reverend Delves. She stood up for what the character believed in. The student as Lady Higg was able to recognize the injustice of the situation and decided to do something about it. As a citizen she demonstrated what the APEF document terms "an understanding of equality, human dignity and justice" (1999, p. 18), one of the key outcomes of citizenship. Not only did she demonstrate such an understanding but also, demonstrating another key outcome, she took "appropriate action" (p. 18).

What I cannot reflect on or interpret are the thoughts of the other students in the class at the time. Before the scene took place, the groups had an opportunity to express their decision as to whether they would offer Tinker Jim food, and all of the groups decided to give him food, but I do not know if they agreed with Lady Higg's decisions to reprimand Reverend Delves and to ask him to leave her home. However, they were witness to her decisions, giving them the opportunity to experience them

vicariously. According to Thompson (2001), this vicarious experience offers possibilities in the development of empathy.

Outcomes of the APEF

Key outcomes from the following strands have been touched on in the drama: "Citizenship, Governance and Power" (1999, p. 16), "Individuals, Societies and Economic Decisions" (p. 22) and "Interdependence" (p. 24). However, the greatest number of achieved outcomes are from "Citizenship, Governance and Power." Within this drama, the students learned about rights and responsibilities of citizens, developed an understanding of equality, human dignity and justice, recognized power and authority in the lives of the characters, learned that different people have differing opinions and how people can be influenced into making decisions.

Although only Stephanie as Lady Higg challenged the power and authority of Reverend Delves in the improvised scene, all the students had the opportunity to achieve the above outcomes. Each student had the opportunity in small groups to decide whether or not to give food to Tinker Jim. In making that decision, the students not only learned about the rights and responsibilities of citizens but acted on those responsibilities. Each student knew that Reverend Delves did not agree with giving food to Tinker Jim, yet they chose to give him food, recognizing that people have differing opinions. They saw how Reverend Delves attempted to influence Lady Higg's decision. They may have questioned what they would have done had they been playing the role of Lady Higg. Stephanie gave the students the opportunity to understand human dignity and justice through her statements and actions. Having

achieved these outcomes prior to grade three, this grade two class exceeded the expectations of the APEF (1999).

Theme Two

Developing and Supporting Opinions: But I believe. . .

Within this theme students had the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to form and change opinions. I present three scripts from a variety of situations:

Year One: Lily taught grade one with *Jack and the Bean Stalk* (Winston, 1997).

Year Two: I taught grade 6 with *The Highwayman* (Flemming, 2000).

Year Three: I taught grade 6 with *In the Earliest of Times.*

Jack and the Bean Stalk

The transcribed, but edited, court case is the final activity in the drama of *Jack and the Bean Stalk*, developed and taught by Lily. The students, as villagers, have been asked to make a decision about what should happen to the harp, the gold and the hen that Jack stole from the giant.

Setting: The people's court in Jack's village.

The people are gathered in the court to hear the giant ask that Jack be penalized for stealing his hen, his gold and his harp.

Giant: What do you think, tasty little, I mean nice little girl?

Villager 4: I think Jack should go to jail!

Giant: I'm with you. I think Jack should go to jail.

Many Villagers interrupt and call out: NO! You should go to jail.

Giant: Why do you think that?

Villager 4: He stole from you.

Villager 5: No you should go to jail. You stole that stuff from his father.

Giant: Do you have any proof of that, Mr. Know it all boy?

Villager 5: There's a picture of his father and him with the hen, the gold and the harp.

Giant: I would like to see that picture.

Many Villagers call out: No. You would rip it up.

Jack produces a book with a picture of his father. The giant holds up the picture and scoffs.

Giant: *(dismissively)* He says this is a picture of his father. I don't see any gold. *(coaxingly)* What do you think intelligent little boy?

Villager 6: I think you should go to jail!

Giant: *(gruffly)* I've changed my opinion of you. Why should I go to jail?

Villager 6: You stole his stuff. He had proof it was his.

Giant: Hang on, I can prove it was my stuff. *Holds up a different book.* Look here. Does it say here that I stole the gold. It just shows a dense little boy who took some magic beans and climbed up the bean stalk and stole my stuff. If he hadn't found those magic beans he never would have found the gold. What do you think?

Villager 7: You stole those things.

Several villagers get up and go and get proof (books) to back up their opinion.

Giant: There's new evidence that's being presented. Let's listen to the new evidence.

Villager 8: Look see here. It's says, here's the giant that killed your father.

Giant: What? What? Read that again.

Jack: You killed my father?

Villager 9: You killed Jack's father?

Villager 8: *(reading)* Here's the giant that killed your father.

Giant: It does say that but I have more evidence. (*He turns to the front cover of the book)* See here, it is about Kate and the Bean Stalk. Is your name Kate? HA! I rest my case.

Villager 4: I've changed my mind. I think you should go to jail.

In this script I would like to focus on Villager 4. The giant tried to intimidate her as he asked her what her opinion was, "What do you think tasty little, I mean, nice little girl?" She stated that she thought that Jack should go to jail. When asked why, she responded that Jack had stolen. At this point in time, little evidence had been presented that explained why Jack had stolen the items. Her opinion was simple, Jack had stolen something, Jack should go to jail. Whether the giant's threat influenced her or not is unknown. She did, however, listen to the opinions of the other students, looked at the evidence and in the end changed her mind, "I've changed my mind. I think you should go to jail."

She initially made the decision based on her value system. Stealing was wrong, Jack had stolen something and, therefore, he must accept the consequences of his behaviour. However, she was willing to listen and take into consideration other extenuating circumstances. She had not closed her mind with her initial decision. Taking extenuating circumstances into consideration allowed this villager to change

her mind. She accepted that one cannot always rely on the initial details but needed to take into account other information.

Research Sub-questions:

In this case I would like to consider how drama enabled the students to make informed decisions, how it promoted the use of ethical judgment, and how it allowed students to demonstrate critical imagination.

This student demonstrated she had engaged her critical imagination in a variety of ways. She accepted her role as a villager at a trial. She was asked to give her opinion and she did so willingly. She indicated she had an opinion by raising her hand to be recognized. She accepted that the student playing Jack was Jack and that the teacher playing the giant was the giant. Her imagination was engaged. To demonstrate her critical thinking in this imaginary situation she listened to the evidence brought forward and the opinions and then decided what was reasonable to believe and to do. In changing her opinion after listening to the other villagers she fulfilled Bailin's (1998) contention that critical thinking involves challenging our beliefs. Her original belief stated that stealing is wrong and Jack must be punished for stealing. Her later belief acknowledged that Jack had reason to steal and that the giant was the person who had done wrong.

In considering more information and evidence, she then changes her mind, making an informed decision.

In order to demonstrate ethical judgment, this student took all evidence into consideration. She made up her mind as to what was ethically right, choosing between the giant's demands and Jack's stealing. What she decided was that,

although Jack had stolen items from the giant, the reasons behind the theft were rational enough to excuse the stealing.

Outcomes of the APEF

The grade one girl who played Villager 4 in this script indicated a clear understanding of power and authority in the life of the character as well as how groups can influence decision making. She understood that others may have differing opinions and took age appropriate action. Each of these statements exceeds the expectations for "Citizenship, Governance and Power" (1999, p.16). As I indicated previously, children are frequently underestimated in their ability to reason and think abstractly (Egan, 1989). However, abstract and critical thinking can be encouraged in a classroom through an *Erfahrung*. Using drama to explore Social studies can succeed in challenging children to think abstractly and critically.

***A Highwayman Comes Riding* (Flemming, 2000)**

The grade six students involved in the drama about *The Highwayman* (Noyes & Keeping, 1981) spent many days exploring the poem and its characters. The recreated script below is constructed from two excerpts of conversations with the class regarding who was the hero in the poem. The first section was a conversation that took place shortly after we began to experience the poem. I wanted the students' initial reactions to the poem and to know who they thought was the hero. Although we had read the whole poem, we had not engaged in the activities that explored the poem in depth. The second part of the script took place after all the activities for the drama had been completed. At this point in time, my intent was to discover if their

initial thoughts of what constituted a hero had changed. Had the poet had any influence on the students?

If My Mom. . .

Setting: Drama room with a grade six class.

Teacher: Who do you think is the hero of the poem?

John: Not the Highwayman.

Teacher: Why not?

John: He couldn't be the hero because he stole and that was wrong. If my mom ever caught me stealing I would be grounded forever.

Alice: Not all heroes have to be good, some can do things that are wrong.

Adam: Like Spiderman.

Dustin: Stealing doesn't mean you can't be a hero.

Jeffrey: Maybe he gave money to the poor.

John: But stealing is just wrong.

Our later conversation.

Teacher: Have your impressions of the characters changed?

John: Mine sure have. I used to think that the Highwayman was bad because he stole stuff. But now I see him as a hero.

Teacher: What made you change your mind?

John: I guess it was because I understand the poem better.

Dustin: Yeah, Tim is the snitch. Snitches are bad.

Teacher: If you saw someone stealing something would you tell?

Several students call out: No way. Are you kidding?

Teacher: Why not?

Jeffery: Because they might come back and get you.

Teacher: So if someone does something wrong, you wouldn't tell?

Jeffery: Maybe if they didn't know it's me.

Teacher: Do you think the poet feels the same as you do?

Dustin: Well, Tim is pretty ugly.

John: He has mouldy hair.

Carolyn: And eyes that are hollow with madness.

Teacher: So the images of Tim are not pretty.

Students: No. He's ugly. I bet he smells.

Teacher: What about the Highwayman?

John: He loves Bess and he dresses fancy. He wears a velvet coat.

Jeffery: He has a jewelled rapier.

Teacher: So you're telling me that the poet is reinforcing the negative snitch role and the positive hero role through his description. Are there any other places where we see the same kind of information?

Jeffery: TV.

Teacher: So TV tells you that snitches are bad too? But your parents, the principal or I often ask for information about things that have happened. What about that?

Carolyn: Yeah, but you can't tell even if you know.

Initially John was adamant that the highwayman could not be the hero because he stole. His mother had instilled in him the idea that stealing was wrong. He refused to listen to the other students in the class who offered him a rationale for

why the Highwayman could be the hero. They brought in examples of heroes who did not always do good things, like Spiderman. Jeffery made a passing reference to Robin Hood. At the time of this conversation, I was surprised by John's answer. It had never occurred to me that the Highwayman was not the hero. But I also recognized John's comments as being significant. The values that had been instilled in him were strong and to him, stealing was wrong.

By the end of the drama John's thoughts had changed. The Highwayman had become a hero in his eyes. He thought it was because he understood the poem better. In this conversation, the students focussed on Tim, the snitch. Snitching was considered to be reprehensible. Only one student mentioned his fear of retribution but the feeling I got from the class was that the act of telling on someone was completely unacceptable.

Within this situation there were moments of insight for me. First, as the students spoke I suddenly realized that I, too, had been romanticizing the role that the Highwayman played, as Alfred Noyes intended. Not until the students began to talk about the beauty and riches of the Highwayman, did I realize that I had not done what I wanted my students to do, to challenge the picture painted. They introduced the aspect of snitching, which had not been on my agenda, demonstrating the role that the students played within the classroom. The students veered the conversation in the direction that they wanted, overriding my intentions. What was significant to me as a teacher had not been what was significant to the students. In bringing up the topic of snitches, the students focused on what they felt spoke to them in the poem. Because it had not been part of my agenda, I was surprised by the new topic area. At

that point, I was wildly thinking about how to handle the situation. What passed through my mind were incidents in society when people ignored wrongdoing or withheld information because they didn't want to tell on anyone. A recent example (Purdy, 2006) is the four years it took the young people in Edmonton who dropped the rock off an overpass and killed a driver to come forward with what they knew of the situation. The difficulty I had was in thinking quickly about how I could discuss the situation without becoming preachy. Heathcote believes that students' contributions must be valued and accepted without judgment (Heathcote et al, 1991, p. 51). I realized if I fell into a preachy mode, which was easily done, I would transform the conversation into a lecture and in doing so would have rejected the tenets of Heathcote, the voices of the students, and lost the opportunity for critical thinking.

So, I brought the students back to the poem by asking if the poet felt the same way that they did. They immediately mentioned the physical description of Tim. He was ugly with smelly hair. When asked about the Highwayman, they described his rich and beautiful possessions and his love of Bess. Although the students knew of Tim's love for Bess, that did not enter the conversation or sway their beliefs. The students had bought into the beautiful versus ugly stereotypes. The beautiful must be the hero and the ugly must be the villain.

I doubt that the students changed their minds about snitching. Carolyn's final line indicated that she hadn't, but at least we did broach the subject. We examined how the hero robber was glorified and the snitch was vilified. We talked about the dilemma that people, not just students, find themselves in; that people in authority

consistently ask to be given information about wrongdoings but rarely do those with information come forward. We continued to talk about how TV elevates the beautiful and that those who snitch are portrayed as undesirable characters. The messages from literature and popular culture were that snitching was bad, and the messages from teachers and people of authority in their lives were that the students should come forward with information. Here was a conversation that had no resolution but that offered an opportunity to the students and me to at least think about the problem, and to recognize how people can be manipulated by literature and popular culture.

Research Sub-questions

The research sub-questions I discuss in relation to this script are those that ask how drama enabled students to make informed decisions, how it promoted the use of ethical judgment, and how it allowed students to demonstrate critical imagination.

The students did not make informed judgments in this case nor did they use ethical judgement. They allowed themselves to be convinced of the heroic nature of an individual by his apparel and his daring though illegal deeds. The poet romantically depicts a highwayman, a robber and the students accepted his version of the events. We did not know from whom the robber stole. The students presumed it was rich people but it could have been anyone. They did not question whether stealing from the rich was acceptable. They did not challenge this hero yet he obviously benefited from stealing. He was able to buy fancy, expensive clothes indicating that he did not steal for altruistic reasons. The sole dissenting voice in the class changed his mind in the end because he understood the poem better.

The character in the poem who told the authorities about the criminal and where they could find him is described as a crazed individual whose "eyes were hollows of madness" (Flemming, 2000). The students again accepted without question Noyes' image of the snitch. I suggest it reinforced their opinion that was wrong to disclose information regarding others' behaviours.

I sound critical of these students when in fact I, too, had never challenged Noyes and his heroic portrayal of the Highwayman. Not until John questioned the Highwayman's position did I come to realize how the poet had influenced my thinking. More significantly I came to realize how in society we continue to malign the informer. How could I then expect my students to challenge the images when I had not?

The students engaged imaginatively with the poem but not critically. In the various activities they took part in, they suspended disbelief and went back in time. They imagined they were Tim, Bess or the Highwayman. But in those roles the students did not challenge their beliefs. They did not consider all aspects of the situation and make a reasonable decision about what to do. They allowed themselves to be manipulated by the poet into believing what he wanted them to believe. They were able to understand Tim's motive for informing the Redcoats of the Highwayman's intentions but did not accept his actions as ones they could condone.

In retrospect, I feel I could have facilitated the conversation in a more open manner. Despite my desire to engage the students in a dialogue, I am sure my hesitant manner and body language indicated that I wanted them to say that Tim was right to inform on the Highwayman. That the students chose to ignore my indications

was a credit to them. However, perhaps more of the class would have been able to express themselves had I handled the situation differently.

When I chose to include this script in this chapter, I did so because of John and how he changed his mind, fulfilling my criteria of suggesting the role drama can play in providing a forum for opinions to change. But I came to realize as I examined the script over and over again that the thrust of this script was not John's change of opinion but the ingrained issue of informing, snitching. Despite my acceptance of the students' change of focus, it took time and reflection through writing for me to understand what this piece of data really represented.

Outcomes of the APEF

Despite the lack of critical engagement with the poem the students were able to fulfill significant key outcomes. From "Culture and Diversity" (APEF, 1999, p. 20) the students experienced how media influenced people and society, experienced how perspectives influence the way experiences are interpreted, and discussed how pressures to conform can emerge. Because they experienced the situation, they were more than able to describe how they understood what it means to be influenced by media and to feel pressure to conform. During the drama, the students experienced aspects of life in the 18th century and consequently they were able to fulfill a key outcome in "Time, Continuity and Change" (p. 28) to describe historical events and ideas from different perspectives.

In the Earliest of Times

Grade six students in *In the Earliest of Times* explored the Mi'kmaq legend "Jenu" (Whitehead, 1992) which chronicles how the kindness of a family

transformed a cannibal giant, a *Jenu*, while living in the North for the winter. The family brought Jenu back to the summer encampment of the People. In this story the term Jenu is used as a name of an individual and also as the Mi'kmaq word for giant cannibal. I italicize the word when referring to the giant cannibal. While recreating the legend, it became apparent that not everyone in the community was happy with having a *Jenu* living among them. Although this was a planned part of the drama, I did not have to introduce the idea. The students raised this conflict themselves. The students, as community members, were challenged to make a decision as to whether Jenu should be allowed to stay with the community or be forced to leave. The students were introduced to the consensus circle, the means by which the Mi'kmaq would have made this decision. In this recreated script, the community came together to discuss what should happen.

Consensus Circle

Drums and chanting as the class enters the drama room. They sit in a circle. Jenu and the family (hunter, wife, child) who have brought him to the community are part of the circle.

Elder: Before we begin our discussion let us use the sweetgrass to cleanse our minds and our hearts so that we are open to listening to others and only reasoned thoughts come from our mouths.

Elder passes the sweetgrass over head and heart and then passes it around the circle. Each member of the circle performs the same ritual.

Elder: Let me remind you of why we are here. A family of our community who lived in the north have brought a *Jenu* with them. Not everyone is pleased with this. We must decide if Jenu will be allowed to stay with us or if we will ask him to leave.

Dylan: I have confidence in our people. They would not bring Jenu if he meant danger.

Matthew: Jenu attract other Jenu. He should leave.

Wife: Jenu has changed. He is no longer a threat to us. He helped us throughout the winter.

Sara: We should trust Jenu. I have seen no signs since he has been here that he will harm us. He should stay.

Chief: I am unsure. I want my people to be safe but I want to believe what the family has told us.

Jennifer: I think Jenu should leave, he is a danger to us. He may have tricked the family. Remember he has power.

Sam: My father and mother were killed by a Jenu. I will never trust one.

Mark: If he's truly reformed, we should welcome him.

Hunter: He helped my family and he can help all of us.

Elizabeth: Other Jenu will come to look for him and we will be in danger.

Jenu: (*gets up and walks to the chief, hands him a jipijk'am)* This is the only thing that can kill a Jenu. If you are ever worried about me hurting you, use this *jipijk'am* to kill me.

The members of the community murmur.

Child: I was afraid when Jenu first came but he became my grandfather.

Michael: He will protect us against other Jenu. We need him.

Katherine: It doesn't affect me one way or the other.

Jennifer: Since he has given us the *jipijk'am* I feel protected. I want him to stay.

Chief: I think we should think carefully about Jenu and his gift to us. He has shown us that he is trustworthy.

Sam: I will never trust a Jenu. If he stays, I will leave.

Mark: I accept that he has changed. I know he will not harm us. Let him stay.

The people came together to reach a consensus. To prepare them for the task, an elder performed a ritual cleansing to help them to make reasoned decisions. Each member of the community performed the ritual. In doing so, the students immersed themselves in the ways of the People. The members of the community were then asked to voice their opinions. The stories of the *Jenuaq* have been passed down from generation to generation for thousands of years. *Jenuaq* had killed members of the community. The fears of the people were justified. The community knew that other *Jenuaq* could be attracted to the community because of Jenu. But they also knew that a *Jenu* could just appear of its own accord. Jenu's presence was both a help and a hindrance in that he could help them fight other *Jenuaq* but his presence also attracted other *Jenuaq* putting them in greater peril. Only one member of the community did not express an opinion as to whether Jenu should stay or go.

Others in the community accepted that Jenu had changed, that he had rid himself of evil. They trusted the judgment of the family who had lived with him for a winter. Jenu, recognizing and understanding the fears of the people, offered them the only weapon that could kill him. The community was greatly influenced by this

gesture. In doing this, Jenu gave the people a means of protecting themselves. With this new sense of protection, members of the community began to change their minds. But not everyone. One person could not be convinced that Jenu was not a threat and he left the community rather than split the decision of the circle.

Research Sub-questions

In this drama I explored the research sub-questions that ask how drama enabled students to make informed decisions, how it promoted the use of ethical judgment, how it encouraged students to develop creative responses, and how it allowed students to demonstrate critical imagination.

Initially many of the community expressed their opposition to Jenu's staying in the community. They gave solid reasons for their opinions expressing the long believed legends that had been passed down for generations. Some had experienced encounters with *Jenu*. In addition, they had been told by the family how Jenu had fought another *Jenu* who had been attracted to their winter camp.

For this dilemma, there was no right answer. Each community member had to consider all the possibilities and use their ethical judgment to decide if Jenu should be allowed to stay and to decide not what was best for themselves as individuals but what was best for the community. The whole community would be affected by the decision. They had to decide if the kindness that the family had shown Jenu would be extended. Jenu's offer of the *jipijk'am* swayed most of the community members. In offering the *jipijk'am*, Jenu tried to reassure the community that he had indeed changed, that he meant them no harm. But the gesture did not alleviate the problem

of attracting other *Jenuaq*. For those who decided that Jenu could stay, they accepted the added danger in exchange for Jenu's protection.

The person who left the community also showed ethical judgment. Despite Jenu's offer of the *jipijk'am* he could not bring himself to accept the threat of another *Jenu* attack. Rather than split the community, he chose to leave and allowed the people to accept Jenu into the community. No other members of the community objected to his decision, thereby accepting his choice.

In his offer of the *jipijk'am*, the boy who played Jenu presented a very creative response to this dilemma. I have taught this drama several times to students from grade six through to university and he has been the only one to present such a response to the situation. He challenged all of those who opposed his staying to think carefully. He exposed his vulnerability to the community and in doing so overcame most of the concerns and objections to his staying.

All but one student involved in the consensus circle demonstrated his or her critical imagination. I did not have to introduce the dilemma to the community. The students initiated the situation. However, I would suggest that when Katherine said, "It doesn't affect me one way or the other," it was this student's way of expressing her lack of involvement in the process. She didn't really believe in what was going on. The others took on the role of a member of a Mi'kmaq community faced with a problem. They performed the ritual and accepted the responsibility for making a decision. They thought critically about the situation, deciding what was reasonable to believe and to do.

Outcomes of the APEF

This drama allowed the students to experience key outcomes from several of the conceptual strands, including "Citizenship, Power and Governance," "Culture and Diversity," "Interdependence," and "Time Continuity and Change"(1999). In these key outcomes the expectations include the words explain, recognize, identify, and examine. Again these students have had the opportunity to go beyond those expectations because they have lived the situations through the critical imagination. They have experienced a dilemma and how to make a decision by weighing the pros and cons and by taking the whole community into consideration. Through that experience, they came to understandings about responsibility, perspectives, and differences.

For the last two themes, I have chosen to briefly refer to how they manifested themselves in the dramas. Although the themes are apparent I do not feel that they lend themselves strongly to achieving the outcomes of the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999). Consequently an in-depth discussion is not merited.

Theme Three

Showing Kindness: Let me help you

To illustrate the theme of showing kindness to others, I return to two dramas:

Year Three: I am teaching a grade two class in *Tinker Jim*

Year Three: I am teaching my grade six class in *In the Earliest of Times*.

Tinker Jim

The grade two students had the opportunity to decide whether or not they would give Tinker Jim, a homeless man, food if he showed up on their doorstep. Each group had

made the decision to help him. In her role as Lady Higg, Stephanie brought the decision of her group, and in effect the class, to the improvised scene with Reverend Delves. Lady Higg, as a representative of the class, demonstrated what she felt to be her and the class' moral obligation to help someone in need.

In the Earliest of Times

In this drama, there were two instances of showing kindness. When Jenu first arrived in the winter camp of the family, the woman showed kindness to Jenu in an attempt to keep him from killing her and her family. She succeeded and Jenu was transformed. The family brought him with them to the summer encampment of the People. The People had to make the decision as to whether to allow Jenu to stay with them, thereby accepting him as part of their community. Some members immediately accepted him because of his relationship with the family. In doing so they demonstrated their kindness toward Jenu. They trusted and accepted the family's faith in Jenu. Others needed more concrete evidence that Jenu was not a threat. After he gave the Chief the *jipijk'am*, many more were able to put aside their fears and show him kindness.

Theme 4

Accepting Responsibility: It's My Fault

To show how students accepted responsibility, I return to two dramas.

Year Three: I am teaching my grade six class *The Highwayman.*

Year Three: I am teaching my grade six class in *In the Earliest of Times.*

A Highwayman Comes Riding (Flemming, 2000)

In this segment of the drama, the class was divided into small groups who were challenged to investigate Bess' death, which had occurred during a police action. Below we see the transcribed final results from three investigators. Tim, while listening to the reports, was overcome with guilt about his part in Bess' death. Although technically he did not put the gun under her breast or pull the trigger, he felt responsible for it.

The Investigation Results

Setting: The conference room of Scotland Yard

Head of Scotland Yard: We will hear from members of the investigative committee into the death of Bess, the landlord's daughter.

Investigator 1: Good news. I found out how Bess got killed. I was going over my papers last night and, well, it was Tim. Tim called the Redcoats on the Highwayman. But the way he planned it did not work out. So it was not in Tim's plan that Bess should die. It happened on its own. Stuff like that just happens.

Investigator 2: I think that the Redcoats killed Bess because they are the ones who tied her up to the bedpost and tied the gun up to her.

Investigator 3: I've come to a conclusion after many hours of thinking. When being interviewed, the landlord offered very little information although he did tell us that he knew about the relationship between the girl Bess and the Highwayman, yet he did not try and stop it. So I am prone to think that he would not set up a murder because he cared about his daughter's dealings. It was obvious that Tim tipped off the soldiers because in an interview with Tim he told us he might have said a little bit

to a friend. Yet still it is not his fault that Bess died. It was the troop of Redcoats' fault. First of all, they did not have to use Tim's clues and they also did not have to put a gun by her. I don't think an officer with higher rank told them to do it because they told us they were drunk.

Tim stands up and bursts out to the committee.

Tim: Hey, my name is Tim and, yes, I did call the Redcoats on the Highwayman. Some may say I am the reason Bess is dead and some may say it is her fault for pulling the trigger on the gun. But I say I loved her and I did not want her to die. But that is what had to happen. So yes, I guess I am the reason Bess is dead.

In the Earliest of Times

In a consensus circle, the people of the community came together to decide if Jenu should be allowed to stay with them. In this situation, Jenu was aware of the position in which he has placed the family who befriended him. He knew it was his fault that the community was in upheaval. He attempted to ameliorate the situation by staking his life on the outcome. He realized that in order to convince the community that he would not attack them he had to endanger himself to the same extent that the community was jeopardized . He said, "This is the only thing that can kill a *Jenu*. If you are ever worried about me hurting you, use this *jipijk'am* to kill me." In this statement he did not say if he threatened the community but only if you are "worried about me hurting you." In doing so, he accepted that they may choose to kill him but he was willing to do so because he had truly been transformed.

The family who befriended him also accepted responsibility for the situation and attempted to convince the others that they were not in danger.

Child: I was afraid when Jenu first came but he became my grandfather.

Hunter: He helped my family and he can help all of us.

Wife: Jenu has changed. He is no longer a threat to us. He helped us throughout the winter.

Here the family acknowledged the old beliefs but wanted to convince the rest of the community that in this instance they could believe what they saw and not rely on traditional beliefs.

Conclusion

In this chapter, through the presentation of the data and my analysis of it, I have attempted to demonstrate the complex nature of drama in the classroom and how the use of drama as a pedagogical tool enabled and empowered students. The use of drama created opportunities for students so that they could often exceed the key stage outcomes of the APEF (1999).

Through the complex learning situation (Davis, 2005) which adhered to Heathcote's beliefs (Heathcote et al, 1991), the students felt that their input was valued and respected. This feeling was demonstrated through their engagement with the dramas. Had the students felt they had little input, they would not have participated to the same degree or with the same level of passion.

The dramas set before the students created *Erfahrung* (van Manen, 2005), or impressionable experiences. Through Lily's and my providing *Erfahrung*, students had an opportunity to experience *Erlebnis*, a lived experience (Gadamer, 1975), one with purpose that is not easily forgotten. Again this was exemplified by the rich interactions of the students and in the commonality of the themes that arose.

The nature of the themes including the use of power and authority, developing and supporting opinion, showing kindness, and accepting responsibility signified in-depth critical and creative thinking and the use of ethical judgment.

My data, collected over a three-year period, came from three distinct sources: my own classroom which I taught, Lily's classroom which she taught and five other grade levels which I taught. The themes manifested themselves throughout the project, across grade levels, years, and classrooms. This triangulation (Creswell, 1998) affords me confidence in my findings.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE DATA

SCAMBELL CITY

"A much longer project, which altered radically the behaviour of a class of eleven-year-olds, was the founding of a city-state in which only eleven-year-olds could live" (Heathcote et al., 1991, p. 91).

In this chapter, I explore a drama, "Scambell City," that I developed with my grade six class. This drama was created during Year One and Year Two of the study and in each case continued from the beginning of the year to the end.

This drama was different from the others presented in the study in that it was not based on a story or a dilemma offered to the students. The creation of the city-state afforded an opportunity for students to experience a democratic government, to hold elections, to make and enforce the laws, to be employed, and to develop an economy. It was an opportunity to be engaged in a concrete situation in which the students participated in a "collective struggle" (Giroux, 1991, p. 307) in order "to promote a just and compassionate sense of social order" (p. 305). As well, it was an opportunity for the students to develop agency through their participation in constructing a social state and within that state through the continual reconstructions of "their orientations toward past and future in response to emergent events" (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998, p. 971).

The concept of the students having agency "to mediate or to transform their own relationships to . . . contexts" (p. 964) was important to me because few opportunities arise in which students within a classroom have an opportunity to have so much control. The students were responsible for the evolving city-state. I played a minor role, the grocery store manager, after the initial organization of elections.The concept of Scambell City emerged after reading Heathcote's thoughts about long-term dramas. A single line mentioning the possibilities of changing behaviour by having students accept responsibility for their own world (Heathcote et al., 1991) caught my attention because one of the strands of the key stage curriculum outcomes within the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999) is Citizenship, Power and Governance. The outcomes refer to the government, laws and the use of power within a society. Creating a city-state within my classroom would allow the students to experience first-hand the use and abuse of power, why laws are important, and how democratic government works.

To begin, I asked the students if they were interested in creating a city-state, fashioned loosely after a Greek city-state, explaining it would be a whole-year drama within social studies. In order to be a citizen, you had to be a member of the class. When each agreed that they wanted to take part, we began. The whole class decided on a name for the city-state. And so Scambell City was born. Many decisions were made: what the governing body would be called, who would be head of the governing body, how many members would be in the governing body, how elections would be held. Until we came to the running of an election, I had little input. And then, I offered only information that provided the students with knowledge necessary

to the running of a democracy. The election provided numerous learning opportunities, from submitting nomination papers and developing campaign policy to holding candidate meetings. The students as citizens demonstrated that they took the election very seriously.

After the election, the Senate and president had a monumental task of creating the infrastructure for Scambell City: what employment would be available, what monetary system would be used, what laws were necessary? It quickly became apparent that the citizens needed regular feedback from the Senate and so weekly meetings were established. This meant that the Senate and citizens needed to learn about how to run a meeting. Some of *Robert's Rules of Order* (1984) were put into place. What began as an occasion for the Senate to share information evolved into an opportunity for the citizens and the elected Senate to consult on the development of the city-state.

Significant issues such as law-making, wages, and jobs were discussed and decided upon at the weekly meetings. Deciding how much the citizens should be paid for their jobs provided a very interesting discussion. Citizens argued how much each should be paid for their job, and finally decided it was best to pay everyone the same amount. One boy continued to argue the whole year that equal payment wasn't fair. He emphasized whenever the opportunity afforded itself that each individual should be paid according to the work he or she did.

During these meetings, my role involved providing on-going information regarding the grocery store and its functions. Playing such a small part allowed me the opportunity to videotape many of the meetings.

The two scripts (Ely, 1997; Saldaña, 1999) I have created have been transcribed and edited from a court case and a Senate meeting both of which took place during Year One. I will analyse these two scripts by examining three themes that emerged, these three echoing three of the four that were discussed in Chapter Four:

1. using power and authority

2. developing and supporting opinion

3. accepting responsibility

In addition, I analyse the scripts in the same means as used for the dramas presented in Chapter Four: their relationship to the research sub-questions (Wellington, 2000) and how they fulfilled outcomes of APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999).

Do You Swear to Tell the Truth?

As a citizen of the city-state, each student applied for and was given a job. These jobs ranged from banker to police to lawyer. Out of the job of lawyer grew what became an essential aspect of Scambell City, the development of a court system. The students, with no encouragement or support from me, developed a legal system to deal with citizens who contravened the laws of the city-state, and they began to have trials during lunch hour. However, I may have influenced the development of the legal system when discussing employment and job creation. Two jobs were created, police and lawyer. I cannot state who made the original suggestion but I did support it. In actuality, the police had little to do with the legal system,

rather it was the citizens who took each other to court for infractions. I became aware of these trials only after I was asked to stay and supervise. For the first few trials, I worked in the adjacent classroom while the trials were carried out in the drama room. It took time before I realized the significance of these trials and began to observe and videotape them.

The courtroom was set up with the judge at the front of the room, the jury to the judge's right and the prosecution and defence facing the judge. A bailiff stood to the judge's left to swear in the witnesses. Rather than a Bible, he used a crown, a costume available in the room, which he placed on the witness' head to indicate that the witness had been sworn in. As I watched the proceedings, I became aware of the limited knowledge the students had of courtroom procedure but I did not intervene. It was their version of a television courtroom. For example, lawyers were not identified as either defence or prosecution. The lawyers were simply referred to as Dean's lawyer and Jacob's lawyer. To clarify for the reader who is suing whom, I have named the lawyers as defence and prosecution. The manner in which the citizens conducted the trial suited their needs even if it did not conform to standard courtroom practice.

The following court case stemmed from an issue between two students, Jacob and Dean. This was not the first time that Jacob had been sued by another student. Dean was suing Jacob for invading his personal space.

Setting: Courtroom of Scambell City

Judge: Tell me why you're here.

Defence: Well what I understand is that Jacob dropped some money on the floor and Dean picked it up and gave it back to him. Then Jacob picked Dean up and swung him around. That's what I hear.

Judge: Jacob, can you please take the stand?

Jacob takes the stand.

Bailiff: Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

Jacob: I do.

Bailiff places a crown on Jacob's head.

Judge: In your own words what happened?

Jacob: I dropped the money. Dean got it up. I said, "Stop thief!" He gave it to me and I said I was just kidding about the whole thief thing and then I walked away.

Dean takes the stand.

Bailiff: Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but thé truth?

Dean: Yes.

Bailiff places a crown on Dean's head

Prosecutor: Could you tell the court in your own words what happened?

Dean: Okay, we were walking back. Jacob dropped a dime. I picked it up and gave it to him. Then he called me a thief. Then I was just walking. Then he put me to the centre of the room then he picked me up and spun me around.

Prosecutor: I'd like to call a witness to the stand.

Jacob: A witness? There was no one there.

Evan: Yes there was. I saw ya.

Evan takes the stand.

Bailiff: Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

He places the crown on the witness's head.

Prosecutor: What did you see?

Evan: I saw him pick up the money. *Pointing to Jacob*, He called "Thief!!!!" He was like "Thieeef." Then Dean gave him back the money. Then Jacob went in back of Dean and picked him up and spun him around.

Jacob takes the stand.

Defence: Jacob, do you know any reason why everyone is saying that you spun him around?

Judge: Why did you spin him around?

Jacob: I didn't spin him around. And no one was in the room. He didn't see it.

Evan: Yes I did.

Judge: Evan, when did this happen?

Evan: I don't know when.

Defence: Okay why were you and Dean in the drama room in the first place?

Jacob: I was going to get something. I had some money in my knapsack. I meant to put it in my pocket but I missed. Dean picked it up. I said, "Thank you," then, "Thief!" And then he gives it to me. I did not pick him up and spin him.

The judge asks the jury to deliberate and come back with a verdict.

Rose: The jury has reached a verdict. We find Jacob guilty.

Judge: Jacob, you have been found guilty of spinning Dean around. I fine you ten dips. You give the money to Dean.

Jacob: Yeah, right!

Jacob gives money to Dean.

In my experience in the classroom, the invasion of personal space is a continual irritant among students. An invasion of personal space could include touching another's personal affects such as a school bag or pencil or physically touching the person of another. In this case, Jacob had allegedly picked Dean up and spun him around. That kind of behaviour was frowned upon in our school because what may have begun as an innocent gesture could escalate into a serious confrontation.

In this court case, the jury was asked to listen to the evidence and come to a verdict. Similar evidence was presented from both Jacob and Dean, the difference

appearing when Jacob allegedly invaded Dean's space. When the prosecutor called a witness to the stand, Jacob was surprised because he thought that no one was in the room with Dean and him. Evan corroborated Dean's version of the incident.

Jacob may have been shocked for either of two reasons: either he was innocent and so he found it hard to believe that there was anyone who could testify against him or he was guilty and knew that the witness would confirm Dean's story and so he tried to feign his innocence.

The defence suggested that there was a reason people were saying that Jacob picked Dean up as if to suggest that there was a bias against Jacob. The judge asked Jacob why he spun Dean around, inferring that Jacob was guilty and that he should admit to the crime. But Jacob reiterated that he did not spin Dean around and he rebutted that anyone was in the room with them. He raised the possibility that both Dean and Evan were lying by challenging Evan's testimony. The judge intervened, asking Evan when the incident took place. Evan suggested a lack of reliability on his part when he admitted he did not know when it took place.

In the end, the jury decided to believe Evan and Dean's story and found Jacob guilty of invading someone's personal space. He had to pay a fine of ten dips, Scambell City currency.

Theme 1

The Use of Power and Authority: Who's Got the Power?

The power and authority in this drama is distributed among all of the participants. In taking a fellow citizen to court, Dean had power to accuse Jacob of

wrongdoing, to bring him to a trial before his peers and to prove him guilty. Jacob also had power because he had the opportunity to explain his version of events. Both the judge and jury had power because they decided the outcome of the case, the jury deciding the verdict and the judge the fine imposed.

Each of the participants in the trial accepted the power given to him or her by the legal system as well as accepting the power of the others within the system. Jacob may not have agreed that he was guilty of invading another person's space as suggested by his comment, "Yeah, right!" but he accepted the verdict and the fine handed down.

The respect shown by all participants for the authority of the court system stemmed from the creation of the legal system by the students. They played by the rules of the game because they had invented the game. But I would add that the students lived in a society that valued and trusted the court system. For the students, as citizens of Scambell City, the use of the court system was viewed as the best way in which to solve problems.

Theme 2

Developing and Supporting Opinion: But I believe. . .

In developing a legal system, the students stated that they believed that evidence must be presented before opinions could be formed. Citizens were given the opportunity to prove their cases before judge and jury. There were several judges and the jury was chosen from available citizens, truly the defendant's peers. In the case described in the script, both the judge and the jury made an informed decision.

The judge did not presume Jacob's guilt despite having tried him before in court. She waited until a witness confirmed the series of events. However, the judge was premature in suggesting what her opinion was. She may have influenced the jury in their deliberations. The jury decided the verdict after hearing all the evidence. Despite the fact that Jacob was a repeat offender, he was not judged until the prosecution had proven his guilt.

However, the legal system was not without its failings. I did witness bias in the proceedings. While observing a court case one lunch hour, I was aware of the bias on the part of the judge. The judge, who was a friend of the prosecution, found the defendant guilty (not all of the trials included a jury) when it was obvious to me that he was not. Other students were observers in the court case but no one, including the defence, challenged the judge. Consequently, I brought the issue up at the next Senate meeting. At that point other citizens concurred with my observations and brought forth examples of their own. A law was then passed obligating judges to excuse themselves if they were friends with either the defendant or the prosecution. Despite this instance, the citizens continued to have faith in the legal system.

Theme 3

Accepting Responsibility: Okay, I'll do it

Jacob accepted the court's decision. He felt that he had had the opportunity to present his case before his peers. He may not have agreed with their decision but he accepted it and paid the fine. In this manner, he accepted responsibility for his behaviour.

In addition, each of the students who took part in the trial accepted responsibility for being active citizens, for accepting the agency given to them. Each of these students was willing to give up their lunch hour in order to participate in the trial. In doing so, they demonstrated how they respected and valued the city-state, the laws that governed it and their role in maintaining order. They demonstrated that the city-state had become real to them, real as described by Bai (2006), "What is real is what really matters and has the power to affect us most deeply" (p. 10).

The court case is only one example of how students accepted responsibility. Within the drama of Scambell City, the students demonstrated daily how they were willing to accept the responsibility of being citizens of the city-state. Although not all performed their role equally, each citizen accepted responsibility by fulfilling a position. Bankers paid citizens on a weekly basis; they created money as was necessary; clerks sold food from the grocery store; elected officials met to deal with current problems; secretaries wrote minutes of meetings and, as demonstrated above, lawyers argued cases. Scambell City became an integral part of their school lives.

Research Sub-questions

Each of the research sub-questions was addressed through this drama: how drama enabled students to make informed decisions; how it promoted the use of ethical judgment; how it encouraged students to develop creative responses; and how it allowed students to demonstrate critical imagination.

A legal system demands that citizens support their opinions with evidence. By Dean's choosing to take Jacob to court and by Jacob's accepting being taken to

court, both students embraced the idea that they needed to prove their version of the incident. The judge and the jury, in accepting those positions, recognized that they needed to assess the evidence before making a decision. All information had to be taken into consideration before coming to a verdict.

By holding trials, the students created the opportunity to demonstrate ethical judgment. Jacob was a repeat offender, and both the judge and the jury were aware of this information. However, they listened to the evidence presented before deciding that Dean's story was more reliable than Jacob's. The judge did indicate her feeling that Jacob was guilty during the trial by asking him why he spun Dean around. In asking this question, the judge overstepped her authority by expressing this opinion but she did not do so until corroborating evidence had been presented supporting Dean's story. I suggest that she continued to demonstrate ethical judgment despite her asking the question.

What was most striking about this trial was that it happened. The legal system was a most creative response to a never-ending problem in elementary school classrooms: how to express to a fellow student that his or her behaviour is unacceptable. The students expressed their displeasure in a novel manner. They did not call names, or push or yell. They did not tell on someone. They took the perpetrator to court. In doing so, the students explained that certain behaviours were unacceptable in a manner that did not alienate the student or aggravate the situation.

But one must question the efficacy of the legal system. Did the students' behaviour improve? Did being taken to court make a difference? While a direct

cause and effect cannot be affirmed in this case (I have no idea how many times Jacob had been called to task regarding his behaviour in previous years or if the number of incidents decreased) I do know in the case of another child, who was often brought to court, the number of times he was suspended from school for inappropriate behaviour decreased dramatically. This may not be conclusive proof that the legal system had a positive affect on this student's behaviour but it is worth noting that the boy was suspended far less frequently.

The legal system that the students created demonstrated the complex nature of the critical imagination. Although this city-state was an imaginary invention, the students took it and their roles in it very seriously. They recognized a need within the city-state and did something about it. It was so important that they gave up their lunch hours in order to participate in it. Jacob, who was fined for his behaviour, accepted the verdict of the court and paid his fines. In this self-organizing and self-transforming learning system (Davis, 2004), the students saw the need for a legal system and went about creating it.

Outcomes of the APEF

From the nature of the drama, experiencing key outcomes from "Citizenship, Power and Governance" (APEF, 1999, p. 16) would be expected. With the exception of describing the Canadian constitution, all key outcomes of this concept strand have been touched on. Outcomes from other strands were explored through this drama including, from "Culture and Diversity," how groups, institutions and media influence people and society (p. 20), from "Interdependence," how to examine and

explain the causes and consequences of interactions among individuals, groups and societies (p. 24), from "People, Place and Environment," how to identify and describe how people create places that reflect humans needs, values and ideas" (p. 26).

Scambell City Senate Meeting

In the city-state of Scambell City, a government, the Senate with a president, had been elected. It became evident in the early stages of the city-state that the citizens needed a forum through which they could be kept abreast of what the Senate was doing as well as to have the opportunity to bring up issues that they wanted to discuss. The weekly Senate meeting was established, chaired by the President of the Senate. During the first meeting, it was decided that the laws would be created by the whole city-state. As the city-state evolved, new features were added to the meetings as the need arose, as, for example, when committees were formed, members reported on the committee's work.

To facilitate the democratic running of a meeting, I introduced the students to a limited number of rules from *Robert's Rules of Order* (1984). I chose these rules because they represented the accepted protocol within the Canadian parliamentary system. This was not, however, the only exposure the students had to decision making in societies. During the drama *In the Earliest of Times* the citizens had an opportunity to experience consensus building.

The citizens accepted and used these rules: an agenda was prepared, minutes were kept, motions had to be moved and seconded; the Chairperson, the President of

the Senate, recognized the citizens who wanted to speak. The citizens used *Robert's Rules of Order* (Robert & Vixman, 1984) to serve them. Instances occurred when they did not strictly follow protocol simply because of their limited knowledge of the rules. I did not feel that strict adherence to the rules was a necessary part of the drama.

In this transcribed, but edited, script from the eleventh Senate meeting, discussion was on-going regarding the role of the police within the city-state. Some citizens had begun to question the role that the Senate was playing with regards to the handing out of fines for infractions of laws.

Setting: Scambell City Senate Meeting, Wednesday afternoon.

Paul: Aren't you supposed to recognize the people with their hands up first?

Chairperson: Jerry.

Jerry: Did you just say that you give out the penalties, not the police?

Chairperson: Okay, this is what the police do. I'm just going to give you an example. Let's say Ashley littered. The police come to the Senate and we mark down the X.

Jerry: Well the cops don't normally go to the President if someone gets a traffic ticket or something.

Citizens laugh.

Chairperson: *(hitting the gavel)* Order! Order!

Kirsty: Why can't they just do their job? It's just the same as them putting it down, you putting it down. What difference does it make?

Chairperson: We decided that Senate was going to do that. Charlie.

Charlie: Well maybe we decided but I'm just going to say that if the police don't give out the penalties then there's no point having them. There really isn't.

Chairperson: But the Senate can't make sure that this whole city is organized. The police are there. The Senate isn't. They can see better if someone breaks the law.

Charlie: Exactly, that's what I'm saying. If they don't give out the penalties then why do we have police? It isn't realistic. In real life, the government doesn't have anything to do with police.

Chairperson: But this is Scambell City. It isn't real.

Charlie: But I thought that was the point. It's supposed to be real, isn't it?

The citizens all begin talking at once.

Chairperson: Order! Order! *(points to Brandon)*

Brandon: If someone in the class breaks the law and you're in the classroom then you already know about. So why have police?

Chairperson: The Senate can't do everything.

Citizens all begin talking. But you try to. You're doing too much.

Chairperson: Order! Order! *Chairperson finds it difficult to keep the citizens under control.* Order! Order!

Other members of the Senate call out "Order." Eventually the citizens quiet down.

The only thing the Senate does is take care of the penalties, makes sure that everyone has a job and keeps the city organized. People who have the jobs are supposed to do the work, not us.

Brandon: You just said that the people with the jobs are supposed to do them. Then why aren't the cops giving out the penalties?

Chairperson: Because the whole class decided that the Senate was going to do it.

Jerry: We decided that you would make up what the penalties would be, not that you would give them out.

Chairperson: But…

Jerry: Uh, I'm not done.

Citizens erupt again.

Jerry: You say people are supposed to do their jobs but you try and run the whole town.

Chairperson: But we do run the whole town.

Kirsty: You have to let people do their jobs.

Other citizens: Yeh, you do try to run the whole town.

Charlie: I move that the police give out the penalties.

Numerous students raise their hands and call out: I second it.

Chair: It's open for discussion.

Kirsty: I call for the question.

Chairperson: All those in favour raise your hand.

Almost all the students raise their hands including members of the Senate.

Majority rules.

At this meeting the citizens of Scambell City were engaged in a, sometimes, heated discussion about the role of the police in the city-state. Paul was concerned because he noticed that Jerry had his hand up for a long time waiting to be recognized yet the Chairperson chose to ignore Jerry. Paul felt it was his responsibility to bring this to the attention of the Chair. She acknowledged Paul's concern by recognizing Jerry.

Jerry asked for clarification on what he thought he heard the Chair say regarding the Senate imposing the penalties on citizens who broke the law. The Chair gave an example of what would happen if a citizen broke a law and the duties the police and the Senate have in such a case. Jerry challenged the rationale of the Chair's explanation by suggesting that cops normally did not discuss minor law infractions with the President. The citizens at the meeting erupted in laughter at the ridiculousness of Jerry's example which, in turn, demonstrated the ridiculousness of the Chair's example. When Jerry showed the citizens the irrationality of the situation, they demonstrated their agreement with his statement by laughing. The Chair tried to impose her authority by calling for order. It took some time but the citizens did settle down. Kirsty agreed with Jerry, wondering what difference it made who wrote down the penalties. The Chair explained that "we" decided that the Senate would do this. The Chair at this point did not explain who "we" were but the

citizens appeared to accept that it was a reference to them. They knew that their voices were the ones who made the laws and the decisions. Charlie acknowledged that "we" made the decision but in his opinion it was a bad decision. He supported his opinion by explaining that if the police did not do the whole job, there was little point in having police.

The Chair tried to explain the role of the Senate. The Senate could not see everything, that the police had an important role to play in watching to see who broke laws. Charlie agreed completely which was why he wanted the police to do the job they were assigned to do. He wanted the situation to be realistic. He explained that in real life, the government did not deal directly with the police. Charlie was, in fact, unaware of the impact that the Office of the Solicitor General has on the police and their duties. Although each has their own jurisdiction, they are intricately intertwined. He was looking at the Senate as the governing body interfering with police action. To him, Members of Parliament or the Legislature did not involve themselves in meting out fines to citizens. When the Chair suggested that Scambell City was not real, Charlie explained that he thought the whole point of creating the city-state was to be real; to give the students the opportunity to participate in something that played out like real life despite the fact it was not.

Charlie's comment caused much commotion among the citizens. I had to wonder what they were thinking. Was Scambell City supposed to be real? Was it just an exercise? It was impossible to know what thoughts were going through the citizens' heads but the din in the classroom suggested that the situation held significance for them.

Again the Chair had difficulty bringing the meeting under control. Brandon joined the debate. He sided with Charlie and explained to the Chair that there was no need for the police if the Senate were in the classroom because they would already be aware of any wrongdoing. The Chair tried to explain that the Senate could not be responsible for everything. At this time the citizens all began talking at once. Comments made indicated the underlying nature of the debate. The citizens believed that the Senate, despite their protestations, was trying to control too much. The Senate was usurping the power of the people. The Senate was trying to do too much.

The argument at this point became somewhat redundant. But after the Chair reiterated that it had been the whole class who voted on who would give out penalties, Jerry pointed out that the Chair had misunderstood the vote. Jerry's interpretation was that the class voted to allow the Senate to decide what the penalties would be, not to give them out. When the Chair tried to explain, Jerry refused to let her interrupt him. Again chaos descended on the meeting. When the citizens finally stopped talking, Jerry continued declaring that the Senate tried to run the whole city-state. The Chair agreed and the citizens shouted comments concurring with Jerry. When order was restored, Charlie took the opportunity to make a new motion explicitly giving more power to the police. Here, the motion emerged as a solution to a problem following a heated discussion. Although perhaps not technically following protocol, it demonstrated how the students used their knowledge of protocol. Many students seconded the motion. Kirsty ignored the call for discussion and called for the question. When asked for votes, the Chair

immediately recognized that the majority had voted in favour. She did not bother to ask for nays or to count the raised hands.

Theme 1

The Use of Power and Authority: Who's Got the Power?

The Senate and the President, as Chair, ran the Senate meetings. By virtue of being elected by the citizens, they had been given a place of authority and power within the city-state. They physically stood at the front of the room and the Chair recognized which citizens would speak and in what order they would speak. The Chair felt her authority but she also recognized the citizens' authority. She felt obliged to explain and justify the Senate's position. The Senate members deferred to the authority of the Chair by expecting her to provide the explanations. They also expressed their authority by calling for order when the citizens did not appear to be listening to the Chair.

Paul, a quiet student who rarely offered comments in class, first called into question the authority of the Chair by reminding her that she was supposed to recognize people in the order they put up their hand. He knew and accepted the authority of *Robert's Rules of Order* (1984) and wanted to make sure that the chairperson also accepted those rules. She accepted this reprimand and immediately recognized Jerry who had been waiting to speak.

In the city-state of Scambell City, the President, the Members of the Senate and the citizens shared power and authority. Jerry accepted his power by questioning the authority of the Senate to punish citizens who broke the law and the role the

Senate played in handing out penalties. The Chair tried to minimize what the Senate did by explaining they were only the recorder of infractions and that the citizens had given the task to the Senate. She believed that it was not the Senate who was arbitrarily using this power because the citizens had asked them to use it. First Kirsty, then Charlie and Brandon exercised their power as citizens by supporting Jerry's point of view. Charlie also acknowledged that the law had been passed but that perhaps the citizens needed to rethink it. It was obvious to him that they had made an error in giving the Senate so much authority. The chair again attempted to support the Senate's giving out penalties by explaining that the class voted in favour of their doing so. Jerry jumped back into the argument stating that they had misinterpreted the law that was passed. The message that Charlie, Brandon, Kirsty and Jerry were giving the Senate was that the Senate was trying to exert too much power in the city-state, that the citizens were not being allowed to do the jobs that they had been hired to do.

Although Jerry, Charlie, Brandon and Kirsty spoke during this argument, in fact, there were constant eruptions from the other citizens either supporting what those recognized were saying or negatively reacting to the response from the chairperson. In effect, they too were questioning the authority of the Chairperson and the Senate. They felt as did Charlie, Jerry, Brandon and Kirsty that the Senate wanted too much control.

Jerry demanded that he be listened to. He told the chairperson who had interrupted him that he would not tolerate being interrupted. He demanded the same respect that he showed. He had raised his hand and waited to be recognized. He

wanted to be heard. He felt as a citizen that he had the authority to make such a demand.

In engaging in this debate, the citizens understood their role in democratic debate. They understood they had the power to question the Senate and the validity of the law they had passed. The citizens demonstrated that they respected and recognized the authority of the Senate by responding when the Chair and the Senate asked for order. They did not respond immediately but quieted down eventually. In taking time to obey the Chair and the Senate, the citizens indicated that they believed that they also had power and authority.

The students understood and accepted the authority of *Robert's Rules of Order* (1984), rules that are used as a standard in democratic governance. Charlie, Kirsty and other citizens used that authority to change what they felt was an unreasonable law. The Chair called for the vote. The Chair acknowledged the decision of the citizens. Established protocol was perhaps not strictly adhered to but the authority and power of protocol was used in an effective manner by all involved.

Theme 2

Developing and Supporting Opinions: But I think . . .

The citizens and the Chairperson both felt that they supported their opinions. The Chair referred to the power given to the Senate by the citizens. She supported her explanation with an example in order that there would be no confusion. She did listen to the citizens as they spoke but she found it difficult to understand why they

had concerns when she felt that the citizens had already had the opportunity to make the decision.

Initially, Jerry gave a real life example in attempting to demonstrate his opinion. Charlie supported his opinion by referring to "real life." Charlie had logically thought about the implications of the law that had been passed and felt that despite the citizens' passing the law, the reality of the law usurped the authority of the police. Jerry, on the other hand, felt that the Senate had misinterpreted the law. However, he did not ask the Secretary to check the minutes to verify his claim. He may not have felt that was necessary because it was obvious from the citizens' reactions that they agreed with him. He also may not have realized that he could or should do it.

The citizens listened to the Chair's, Jerry's and Charlie's justifications and concurred with Charlie and Jerry. When Jerry and Charlie explained their stance, the citizens recognized that it corresponded to their experience. They came to a decision based on the rationale presented and their experiences.

When Kirsty called for the question, it could be debated that she was cutting off discussion of the motion. I suggest that she felt enough discussion had taken place; that the citizens had heard the arguments and were ready to vote; that the discussion had taken place before the motion had been placed on the floor. To have continued with the discussion would only have led to a repetition of what had been said.

Theme 3

Accepting Responsibility: I'll take care of that

The citizens wanted more responsibility and the Senate and President had taken too much responsibility. In both cases, the students demonstrated the willingness to accept responsibility. All had the willingness to accept agency as defined by Emirbayer and Mische (1998) as:

> *the temporally constructed engagement by actors of different structural environments—the temporal-relational contexts of action—which, through the interplay of habit, imagination, and judgment, both reproduces and transforms those structures in interactive responses to the problems posed by changing historical situations.* (p. 970)

The actors in this case are the students and citizens of Scambell City. They have engaged in creating and governing a city-state. They have both developed laws and, subsequently, questioned the validity of a law after recognizing that either it had been misinterpreted or it had not been appropriately stated. The interactive responses to the changing historical situation are exampled by the citizens in the meeting. The Senate wanted only to ensure that the city-state was run efficiently and that the laws laid down by the citizens were upheld, that a standard was maintained. The citizens were unhappy with the Senate's interpretation of the law that they felt manifested the Senate's desire for more power. The citizens wanted more responsibility for the running of the city-state.

The exchange that took place in the meeting demonstrated that both parties were engaged with the process, there was interactive transformation. In bringing forth a new motion and passing it, the needs of the people overruled the interpretation of the Senate.

Research Sub-questions:

Two of the research sub-questions were addressed in this script: how drama enabled students to make informed decisions and how it allowed students to demonstrate critical imagination.

The students in this meeting came with thoughts and ideas but not until Jerry and Charlie articulated their concerns did the other students realize the significance of the actions of the Senate. Not until Jerry and Charlie spoke did the citizens realize the extent of their feelings. The Senate did not understand the significance of their actions until Jerry and Charlie exposed the power grab. From this exposure, the citizens were able to ensure that the police regained the power and authority due to them.

The use of critical imagination in citizenship was most notably demonstrated. The citizens were passionately involved in the running of this imaginary city-state. They firmly believed that they had as strong a role to play as the Senate in governing the city-state. Paul took a stand on what he saw as an injustice. He was not a student who normally questioned authority in the class but within Scambell City, he was empowered to do so.

As citizens, the students wanted the drama to mimic real life, as they understood it, as much as possible. They wanted it to be real. They wanted to equitably distribute power among the citizens. They made reasonable decisions about what to do. The students challenged each other in the roles they played. When the governing Senate did not live up to the citizens' expectations and in their view tried to usurp power from them, the citizens felt it was their responsibility to question the power and authority of the Senate. The passion the students exhibited in this meeting underlined the willingness to suspend disbelief and to engage in the process. But it was the use of Heathcote's Mantle of the Expert (Bolton & Heathcote, 1995) structure to develop this drama that afforded the students the opportunity.

Outcomes of the APEF

The key outcomes (APEF, 1999) of "Citizenship, Power, and Governance" (p. 16) refer to Canadian government. Scambell City was not a model of Canadian government but reflected the intent of a democratic government. The outcomes require that students will be able to identify, describe, give examples of or explain civic rights and responsibilities, the purpose of laws and power and privilege. In participating in Scambell City meetings, the students were engaged in the governmental process. They lived the civic rights and responsibilities and, therefore, not only could they describe or identify the purpose of laws, they developed an understanding of laws and their role in shaping them. Because of their direct interaction with government, the students surpassed the Key Stage Outcomes of "Citizenship, Power, and Governance."

Too often developers of curriculum underestimate the capabilities and understandings of students (Egan, 1989). There is the belief that one must begin with the concrete and progress toward the abstract. We see an example of this in the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999). The students are not asked to take part in the governmental process of making laws but only asked to describe those laws and why we need them. The students are asked to explain and give examples of civic responsibilities, power and privilege rather than assume civic responsibilities and power. As a result of my observations in this research, I suggest that students will be better able to understand why we need laws when they have experienced a process by which they, themselves, have created laws to suit the demands of the society that they have created.

The last APEF (1999) outcome asks that students take age-appropriate action. There are no suggestions for what that entails. The term "age-appropriate" action implies that the students are not capable of full adult behaviour in civic matters. Again, from the results of this research, I suggest that taking someone to court and proving guilt or reassessing the meaning of a law belies this inference that students are less capable than adults.

Primarily, the strand of "Citizenship, Power, and Governance" (APEF, 1999, p. 16) has been addressed in this script. But as with the former script "Do you swear to tell the truth?" key outcomes of other strands have been incorporated, including: "Culture and Diversity" (p. 18), "Interdependence" (p. 22), and "Time, Continuity, and Change" (p. 26). The use of *Robert's Rules of Order* by the students demonstrated, in particular, the understanding of time-honoured protocol.

Conclusion

In the two scripts that are drawn from Scambell City, the notion of agency is noteworthy. In creating the legal system and in participating in the Senate meetings the students demonstrated the kind of agency that civic life in democratic states requires. In accepting the responsibilities that come with agency, they were able to use power and authority to develop and support opinions and to take action.

Living in a democratic society, we, as citizens, have the opportunity to have agency but few readily accept that responsibility. The most obvious manner in which we accept agency is in casting a vote during elections, yet we read that statistically voter turnout is decreasing. We read about voter apathy and that "Canada has been in the grip of a democratic malaise evidenced by decreasing levels of political trust, declining voter turnout, increasing cynicism toward politicians and traditional forms of political participation, and growing disengagement of young people from politics" (Des Rosiers, Colas, Wood, & Stevenson, 2004). Yet in this imaginary situation, these students were granted agency, took hold of it and experienced the sensation of accomplishing meaningful changes. The ability to take a fellow citizen to court over a transgression and to pass a motion giving power to the police allowed the students to know they could transform inequities. That knowledge, I believe, is essential to developing citizens who participate in the democratic process, who realize they have a voice, and who want to make a difference.

CHAPTER SIX

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS: HAVE WE BEEN TRANSFORMED?

In this final chapter I compare my intentions at the outset of this study with my findings at its conclusion. As well, I explore the stories of the teacher participants, why they became involved in the study, and their perceptions of drama and social studies. I then analyse their thoughts, ideas and my findings in relation to the research question (Wellington, 2000): In what ways can the use of drama as a pedagogical tool encourage teachers to teach social studies? Finally, I examine my experience with the study and present my conclusions.

I set about this study with multi-faceted intents. My goals included:

- to create dramas that incorporated the dramatic structures of Boal (1992) and Heathcote (Heathcote et al, 1991)
- to have teachers' change their pedagogy through a socially critical action research (SCAR) project
- to fulfill social studies outcomes of the APEF (1999)

The dramas that I employed were developed primarily using the structures of Heathcote (Heathcote et al., 1991), notably, roles, mantle of the expert, text, dance forms, simulations and games. Within those dramas I incorporated Boal's (1992) Image Theatre. In all of the dramas that I found or created, I asked students to discover solutions to social problems.

Looking at Tripp's (1990) characteristics of SCAR, which include participation, direction, consciousness, constraints and outcomes, I have to ask the question as to whether we fulfilled his criteria. In reviewing the characteristics,

significant questions arose: Did we incorporate new practices into our teaching? Did we increase our awareness of the hegemony of the current social studies practice and "take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (Freire, 2000, p. 35)? Can all teachers use drama as a pedagogical tool? Can they be taught to use drama or is the ability to do so a gift?

In my study, I do not have quantitative data that demonstrates the fulfillment of outcomes of the APEF (1999). How, then, is it that I can suggest that the outcomes have been fulfilled? We need to recognize that test results do not necessarily signify long-term learning. I suggest that the experiences, or *Erfahrung*, in which the students participated create a more profound learning, as indicated in the data analysis in Chapter Four and Chapter Five. It is very difficulty to know what lasting significance this project will have on the students who took part in the classroom dramas or to identify what they have learned from their interactions with drama. I can only describe their interactions and the indications of those actions. And I can look at myself and the teachers who participated in the research study and discuss how we have changed as a result of our interactions over the past three years.

Heathcote and Boal

When I first began the study, I had made no decision about how many of Boal's (1992) structures or how much of Heathcote's work (Heathcote et al., 1991) I would use. I allowed the structures to emerge as dictated by the situation, the students and teachers participating, and the outcomes of the APEF (1999). In the creation of Scambell City, the impetus came from a quotation of Heathcote and the outcomes of APEF but the students and I created the drama as it proceeded. The

students recognized and voiced what was needed and I supported their desires by incorporating new aspects into the drama.

I believe Boal would approve of the agency given to the students and the responsibility that the students accepted in taking on the task of creating a city-state. In creating this city-state the students became critically conscious, involved in Freire's (2000) process of *conscientização*. They learned about ways of governing. Scambell City is not a true Forum Theatre piece; however, Boal (2001) was insistent that people must take his work and make it their own, modify it so that it suits their own purposes. Nor is it a Heathcotian simulation (Heathcote et al., 1991) or Mantle of the Expert (Bolton & Heathcote, 1995), but the drama evolved to include aspects of all three structures. In Forum Theatre, spec-actors are given an opportunity to try different solutions to a problem that has been presented in a theatrical manner. In a simulation, students recreate a life situation; in Mantle of the Expert, they function as experts in a particular field. The creation of a city-state might be viewed as a simulation, but it was not a real life situation because whole communities do not govern a town or city. It might be viewed as Mantle of the Expert, but the students did not recreate the roles within a government. Yet, I feel the intent of these structures was maintained. In Scambell City, different students often tried different solutions to a problem, occasionally not finding any solution. This was evidenced in both the weekly Senate meetings and in the operation of the legal system they created. Although the students did not carry out research into how to conduct a democratic government or a court case, they developed their own expertise suitable for their requirements.

Heathcote (Heathcote et al, 1991) had a belief that from the particular, one could extrapolate to the universal. For her, there existed universal truths (Winston, 1997) that one could expose through drama. I feel it is important to state here that I did not adhere to that tenet in my project. The idea of a universal truth is directly opposite to my conception of drama. In fact, I would suggest that it is the lack of predictability in drama that precludes the finding of universal truths. Scambell City is an example of this lack of predictability. Despite the drama being introduced in the same manner with the same parameters in two different years, the experiences were quite distinct. What was central to one group was not important to the other. This lack of predictability pertained not only to Scambell City but also to each of the dramas used. Having said that, however, there were moments that manifested in the dramas that one could view from a universal perspective.

In looking at the critical moments that I chose to include in my analysis, I noted that each of them was an activity that was either close to the end of the drama or was, in fact, the final activity. In the case of Scambell City, they were situations that occurred after the drama was well-established. This suggested to me that the time spent before the critical moments occurred was essential in preparing the students, inviting them into the drama, and establishing the parameters within which the students would operate.

Belief

In the scripts of the dramas presented in Chapters Four and Five, the students in these classes were engaged in the "willing suspension of disbelief" (Coleridge, 1984, p. 169). They were willing to set aside everyday reality to enter the village of

the Mi'kmaq or 16th century England or climb the beanstalk to reach the giant's castle. How was this accomplished? One teacher learned that the setting of the scene was extremely important. Belinda commented,

> Sometimes I just wanted you to get on with it. I wondered why you spent so much time introducing what the students were going to do, playing games that sort of had a connection with the drama. But I realized that the time spent setting the scene proved to be invaluable later. I realized that the payback was later. In order to get the students to believe, you had to spend the initial time. Now when I work with my class, I always do like you did. I spend the time making sure that the setting is firmly established.

Recognizing the value of setting the scene was an important lesson for me as well. When I first began "In the Earliest of Times" I originally planned to use only creative visualization for the first two sessions. After session three, when I was disappointed with the quality of the participation of my class, I decided to try using creative visualization before we began that day's activities. The difference was startling. The students were back to their initial quality of response. They believed in what they were doing. From that moment, I realized that setting the scene was imperative. A direct, personal experience often brings to light what we have known intellectually. After my realization, I recollected a conversation with David Barnet, a drama professor at University of Alberta, regarding Dorothy Heathcote and her ability to engage students. He got up from his chair, pretended to be Dorothy and looked off into the distance. He stopped and looked at me, saying, "Do you see the

castle up there? What does it look like? Are there any sentries posted?" (personal communication, May 2001). He explained that it was Heathcote's coming out of character to have the students describe what was up ahead that allowed the students to really imagine what was ahead. Yet, I needed to discover this on my own before I became aware of the impact of his example. Belinda needed the same kind of epiphany. Being shown was not enough: she had to experience it. In order for all the students to have a stake in the process and to have adequate knowledge in order to share in the process, the introductory activities are essential. This was a lesson learned for both Belinda and myself. But what of the others? What did they learn?

Was it Socially Critical Action Research?

To know if my study was socially critical action research, I must compare the stories of the teachers with Tripp's (1990) five characteristics of SCAR: participation, direction, consciousness, constraints and outcomes. Questions that I address are driven by these five characteristics of SCAR. Did their intents signify direction? Have the teachers developed new practices? Have they become aware of the hegemony of texts? What constraints continue to prevent them from using drama to a greater extent in their classrooms?

The Teachers

To discover what the teachers learned, I needed to look at where they had begun. What were their thoughts about the use of drama and the teaching of social studies before we began? The stories I collected came from conversations in the staff room, field notes, e-mails and chats. Although each of the nine participants has a personal story, I have chosen not to include all of them. Many teachers described similar details that I combine where

appropriate within someone else's story. To provide an overview of the participants and a broad spectrum of the grade levels, I have included the stories of three teachers who provide a sampling from grade one, three, and five. I felt it was important to include Lily's story because she was the only participant involved from the beginning to the end. However, I do include quotations from other participants in order to demonstrate their growth during the study.

Lily

Lily has taught most grade levels in the elementary school but feels her true calling is to the early years. Consequently, Lily has taught grades Primary and One for many years. Lily's reasons for becoming involved arose from needs of the children and what she perceived as needs within the curriculum. In her class, Lily had both gifted children that she wanted to challenge and others who needed greater experience with oral language. She was also frustrated with the lack of curriculum—in both topic areas and resource materials referred to in the curriculum guide (1981) in social studies at the early levels. The topics assigned were "Me" for grade P and "My Family" for grade one. She felt that the children were much more capable of being involved in activities that promoted citizenship but had found few appropriate resources to use. She hoped that through the use of drama, she would be able to address both deficiencies. Teachers from all grade levels bemoaned the inadequacies of curriculum for social studies due to the lack of resource materials and the worn-out topics.

Belinda

Belinda had taught grade three for many years before moving to grade five. She was teaching in the classroom adjacent to mine when the last year of the study began. Belinda explains why she wanted to join the study:

> I had witnessed a difference in your class from the others in the school and was interested in how this was accomplished. Your students were engaged and excited most of the time. They always seemed to have something on the go, something to look forward to. Your room had a sense of something other than a classroom.

Belinda, like many of the participants, tried to teach the required two hours of social studies per week but she recognized that it was not a time that either she or the students looked forward to. She felt the lecture or what she called the "feed it to them" methodology was not stimulating to the students or to her.

June

June, a grade three teacher for many years, echoed many of Belinda's sentiments. The curriculum was stale and her method of teaching it was stale. This study was an opportunity to enrich learning primarily for the students. She felt that the use of drama in the classroom was very limited partly because teachers had little or no experience with drama and the curriculum didn't include activities promoting its use. She had read the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999) and had confessed to one of the authors that it "scared the living daylights out of us teachers." She felt that with little support and few resources the shift in emphasis from concrete learning (for example, naming the provinces in Canada) to

the abstract (such as understanding the concept of supply and demand) presented an insurmountable task.

From the stories presented, I found that teachers wanted to be part of the study primarily for four reasons, all of which fulfilled the SCAR characteristic of direction:

1. to challenge and support students
2. to improve their pedagogical methods teaching social studies
3. to improve the social studies curriculum by incorporating new topic areas
4. to have support for implementing the outcomes of the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999).

The teachers took pride in their profession and recognized that they were not providing their students with what they saw as good curriculum or good pedagogy. They saw this study as an opportunity to change that.

New Practices

Without exception, each teacher who participated in the project talked about the changes in themselves. First, they noticed a change in the behaviour of their students. Secondly, as a result of the new behaviour of their students the teachers implemented changes in their classroom behaviour or practice. In doing so the teachers found that they had changed their relationship with their students.

Being able to observe their students being taught by someone else afforded the teachers a rare opportunity. They watched their students in a different way, noting who was participating and how they participated and the difference between regular classroom behaviour and behaviour in the drama room. After the sessions

had ended, they noted a carryover from the students' behaviour in the drama room to the classroom and at times beyond the drama room even to the playground.

The behaviour change the teachers first noted was the level of participation by all students. The students had accepted the offer of imagining and were willing to engage wholeheartedly in every activity. Many of the teachers underlined or capitalized the word "all" when they referred to the involvement of students. To involve all students in an activity is a difficult and rare accomplishment. Secondly, "Each year there were one or two students who 'came out of their shells' and became fully engaged. Their contributions were often astounding—quiet children became leaders, soft-spoken children produced big voices, children on the fringe went to the centre," noted June. Carol was impressed with the students' participation: "The drama was very beneficial to ALL students. I was amazed at how the students who usually hold back and rarely feel safe to share their ideas just bloomed in the context of drama."

These teachers discovered that the use of drama structures (Boal 1992; Heathcote et al, 1991) in the classroom encouraged students to take a more active role in their own learning. Joyce, in describing the process her students went through, says that "using drama as a tool to teach puts the onus on the students to use past experiences and imagination to respond critically rather than the teacher. It's up to them. The whole learning process becomes so much more meaningful." This vital first-step of recognizing how drama engaged students began the process of the teachers adopting the pedagogy of drama in their own classrooms. The teachers, recognizing the value of the interactions among the students, then began to

incorporate the use of drama structures in their own classrooms. "These classes made it easier for us to incorporate role play and choral response in all classes—math problems were willingly acted out and everybody wanted to try a voice as characters in different stories. . . . They had a new willingness to take risks as they performed in front of their peers," remarked June.

"I am thankful that I was able to participate in last year's activities and personally enjoy the carry-over into my own teaching practices. I do strongly feel that the opportunities I now provide my students to get up, move, act and interact with each other helps keep their focus in other subject areas and also provides critical experience in appropriate ways to interact with others in respectful ways." Patricia noted the change in her practices but also sees the opportunities that she provided as crucial in helping students to develop positive social skills, outcomes of the APEF (1999). Patricia became aware that in using drama the students were more focused on the subject material. When students are focused, teachers have a sense that they are accomplishing more.

Carol also recognized how she could use drama in other subject areas: "Before the sessions it would not have occurred to me to link drama with science concepts, but it really fits anywhere and all of the Language Arts outcomes are embedded in most drama activities." Carol had taken the structures introduced to her in social studies and was now applying them to science and language arts. June, as described previously, had begun to use role-play to teach math. These teachers had taken tools given to them, modified them to meet their needs and changed their teaching methodology in ways not introduced in the project. In that way the teachers

went beyond my expectations or hopes. They saw the value of drama, and recognized how it could be implemented in any subject area. But, to date, with the exception of Lily, none have attempted a whole drama such as "Jack and the Beanstalk."

When asked how they and their practice had changed, Lily, June and Belinda each felt that they had come to recognize the value of drama as a pedagogical tool. Their initial thoughts about drama had been very similar. They had viewed drama as a theatrical piece of work, a play to be performed or a skit to be put on. Only after they had participated in the study did they come to understand how drama could be used to delve into a character's thoughts or motivations or how they could place their students in moral dilemmas. They came to realize the versatility of drama structures (Boal, 1992; Heathcote et al, 1991) and their application to any lesson.

Lily came to realize that drama enabled students to understand story in a manner that she had been unable to achieve previously. For example, in "Jack and the Beanstalk," Lily had read to the students five different versions of the fairy tale. She then asked them to retell the story using a story wand. Each student told a piece of the story before passing the wand to the next person. She was shocked to find that the students didn't remember the sequence of events in the story despite having heard it five times. The experience caused her to wonder how many other stories they had not grasped despite having read the story numerous times. She recognized that the drama structures that explored different aspects of the story were invaluable in helping the students to gain not just text comprehension but also to come to understand character and motivation. Lily also recognized that, through using drama

to teach, her own understanding of story deepened and that previously she had overlooked many of the underlying meanings within a text.

Each of the teachers commented on the value of my modeling the drama structures as an important step to using drama structures in their classrooms. Although they themselves had not participated in the classes, they were able to watch carefully how I questioned, and how I used different structures to draw the students into the drama. The teachers during the observation period were broadening their zone of proximal development (Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). Through observing my work with the children, they were able to experience how to use drama structures. They were able to experience the efficacy of drama.

Through observation, they witnessed how allowing the students to control their learning motivated them to participate. Consequently, Belinda, June and Lily, in addition to others, spoke of learning to listen to their students. In their opinion, they previously had propelled the students forward according to the teacher's agenda. While using drama, they had to stop and listen and follow the lead of the students. In doing so, the students had more opportunity to think both critically and creatively.

The teachers involved in this study have begun to develop some confidence and expertise but continue to need more time and experience to complete the pedagogical transformation that J. Wilkinson (personal communication, May 2002) suggests requires three to five years of study. In retrospect, had I begun the study using the format of the final year, I would have been able to provide the teachers with the necessary support. I would have been able to provide them with the next step in the process, learning how to create or modify dramas, and continued until the

teachers were regularly using whole dramas in addition to supplementing lessons with drama structures. This type of mentorship is essential in developing new pedagogical practices. School boards, departments of education need to recognize that if teachers are expected to develop new practices, they need the support of a mentor for a substantial period, three to five years.

In terms of Tripp's (1990) characteristic of outcomes, the teachers had included new practices in their repertoire. However, I must explore his characteristic of consciousness. The teachers needed to have learned "to perceive social, political and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (Freire, 2000), in particular, to recognize the hegemony of social studies textbooks and the perpetuation of the dominant culture view (Johnston, 2000) of the "Other."

Recognizing Hegemony

I discovered in my school that few classrooms used social studies textbooks. The only grade with a text assigned to it was grade six. It is a very old text and was not used in our school. However, there were numerous resource books that were used at every grade level in the elementary school. Over the past few years, our school has made an effort to eliminate social studies related books with outdated information, slanted perspectives or inappropriate language. Our school board has a very active Race Relations Cross Cultural Understanding and Human Rights Committee (RCH) that has worked diligently to educate teachers about the hegemony of texts and to remove them from the schools. Our school has a sitting member on the RCH committee and she regularly updates us with new opportunities. As an example,

through RCH, I was able to attend a three-day retreat at Bear River First Nation. In subsequent years, three other teachers have also attended this retreat.

Through initiatives of my school board through RCH, I found that the teachers with whom I worked had become better educated in recognizing hegemony in texts. The work that I had thought my study would address had been addressed by the school board. The teachers were making efforts to increase and to improve the social studies content of both First Nations and African Nova Scotian peoples. The teachers continue to look to me to provide them with resources, both stories and dramas, to augment the curriculum in this area. The resources that they want to use are not readily available. Carol's frustration is evident when she says, "I know what I want to do, but I don't know where to find the stories." Now that the teachers' consciousness has been raised and they have new practices that they wish to implement, they have become very conscious of the constraints caused by the lack of resources. The study has supported the improved consciousness of the teachers but had not instigated it.

Constraints

I have acknowledged that lack of curricular resources continues to be a constraint for teachers but others exist as well. In Chapter Three, I discussed the kind of teacher necessary to use drama to teach curriculum—an energetic person who, among other things, is willing to take risks. Clearly, not all teachers meet these criteria. Is it possible to teach teachers how to use drama as a pedagogical tool? Heathcote (Heathcote et al, 1991) believes it is possible. But to answer the question, I return to the words of the teachers.

Joyce talked about how her confidence had grown: "I remember feeling a little self conscious but still wanted to do it [participate] and getting [sic] into the action. It made me appreciate the position my pupils were in." Although she enjoyed herself, Joyce continued to feel inadequate about using drama, "Because, Susan, you are The Expert, I felt intimidated (not because of any of your actions; you were always very welcoming and inclusive) and was reluctant to take the reins." This feeling of inadequacy was most evident in the drama room. Joyce felt comfortable using drama in her own space. "We did do some dramatizations in spontaneous and small ways, as the situation and the mood struck us—you had done the groundwork and the students were relatively experienced." She also brought up a significant constraint for using drama as a pedagogical tool: the need for support and guidance.

Joyce was not ready to consciously plan to use drama in her class. However, when the opportunity presented itself, she was able to recognize it and use it. The single year that she had participated in the project was not enough experience for her to change her lesson planning, although her spontaneous use of drama signifies a first step. Lily, who participated in the project for three years, was firmly committed to the use of drama as a pedagogical tool. "I will always use drama and dramatic play in my classroom no matter what the grade level I attempt. . . . When you find such a versatile and effective tool, why would you give it up?" This statement of Lily's supports J. Wilkinson's (personal communication, May 2002) findings that for true methodological shift to take place, at least three years of involvement are necessary.

Other teachers have described the changes they have made to their teaching practices, supporting the notion that teachers can be taught how to incorporate drama

into the curriculum. Some teachers will more enthusiastically and more frequently provide such opportunities for their students and, unlike Lily, some may never choose to develop a complete drama. Some may never use a published drama. But with more support and experience I feel that the teachers who chose to participate in the project will continue to develop their repertoire of dramatic structures (Boal, 1992; Heathcote et al, 1991) and feel more confident about including them in their lesson plans.

Time was a serious constraint that became apparent to me while working with other classes. Time was an issue in two distinct ways: doing drama takes time and participating in a research project takes time. In my field notes on a drama with Lily's and my class, I noted a perfect opportunity to introduce the issue of practical jokes. When do they stop being a joke? We never got to that issue. Time ran out and what could have been a significant dilemma for these students never was introduced. We ran out of time. In year three when I worked with other classes, I had only six days in which to present a drama. Often, I had to ask teachers to complete activities in their classrooms, some of whom did and some of whom did not, mostly because of a time constraint. Within my own classroom I had to decide what issues were of such significance that I could take time away from other subjects. Because of the time involved in completing a drama, a teacher may have to make a decision that quality is better than quantity. However, Carol noted that she never felt guilty taking time from other subject areas because in reality, she was able to include so many different subject areas within a single drama. Drama allowed her to teach integrated lessons.

Participating in this research project took extra time that, for teachers, is scarce. Initially, I asked for a two-year commitment from participants. The time commitment was a factor in my not finding participants. Many teachers were interested but could not invest the necessary time. For Lily, time was an issue during the second year of the project. I have no data from her during that time period because something always got in the way of my visiting her classroom to observe her teach drama. Lack of time prevented her from writing field notes about her experiences. I know she continued to do drama with her students but could not find the time to write about the experiences.

In the final year, teachers were willing to participate because the writing took place during the scheduled classes. They did not have to commit to extra time above and beyond taking part in the classes.

A last constraint for finding participants was the perceived need to use the computer. The more experienced teachers in my school were not interested in having to use a computer to post their notes. When that demand was removed, eight teachers signed on as participant observers. Being computer literate, I did not understand the impediment the computer presented. My thought had been that it would open up the project to teachers from other parts of the province.

APEF Outcomes

Two significant developments from the study arose, the first being a greater inclusion of social studies in the curriculum, the second an improvement in the quality of the teaching. Although some teachers were teaching the required time allotment for their grade level, others were not. Teachers had read the APEF Social

Studies Foundation (1999) document and were trying to teach towards its outcomes. The outcomes, not to be confused with Tripp's (1990) outcomes of SCAR, that we chose for the research project were taken from the APEF document. Previously, June had thought it was a good document but that it would be impossible to achieve. Through the drama project, she and other teachers realized that they could fulfill perhaps not all of the outcomes, but a good number of them.

I suggest that the outcomes in the document would be more difficult to achieve without incorporating a pedagogical tool such as drama. Carol felt that the outcomes would be impossible to achieve without the use of drama. "They're too abstract to teach in the 'cover' manner." Because drama encouraged, enabled and empowered students, the students were able to think critically and creatively. Without such a structure, teachers found it difficult to challenge students in ways that would allow them to fulfill the outcomes. If that were not so, then we would not continue to have the problem of social studies being taught as a series of facts (Kincheloe, 2001). Departments of education, regardless from which province, need to be cognizant of the difficulty of achieving the goals they have set out for teachers. They must support the teachers by providing resources both through appropriate materials and through PD opportunities such as the mentoring of teachers. This will encourage teachers to realize that the outcomes of social studies are achievable.

Research Question

This study set out to explore the question: In what ways can the use of drama as a pedagogical tool encourage teachers to teach social studies? Four research sub-questions, discussed in-depth in Chapters Four and Five, addressed the efficacy of drama as a

pedagogical tool. Now I concentrate on the primary research question. I suggest that the use of drama in the classroom does encourage teachers to teach social studies. Teachers came to the study because they saw inadequate curriculum and inadequate teaching methods. They were faced with teaching to new outcomes that they viewed as overwhelming because of a lack of resources and support. As the teachers observed the dramas unfold, they noted that their students were engaged. The students readily participated. They discovered that through the use of drama structures (Boal, 1992; Heathcote et al, 1991) teaching methodology improved as evidenced by the students' critical thinking and creative responses. The dramas used addressed the inadequate curriculum, evidenced by the students' engagement with the dramas. The students did not stop the drama after the half-hour or hour spent in the drama room, but continued to be engaged upon returning to the classroom and beyond into recess and noon time. The dramas excited the children and allowed them to take control of the curriculum. Lastly, the dramas achieved and in many cases surpassed the key stage outcomes of the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999). The teachers, through observation and consequent experimentation, discovered these findings. They realized that they could make social studies interesting to their students, challenge them to think critically and creatively and fulfill the APEF outcomes. The use of drama structures allowed them to successfully integrate subject areas so they did not feel like they were stealing time from one subject to give to another. The teachers who participated in the study made significant changes to their practices and to the curriculum.

My Practice

Has the use of drama structures encouraged me to teach social studies? Have I changed my practice? Simply stated, my practice has changed. I teach many more than the

required weekly two hours of social studies because I often use social studies to teach language arts. In order to achieve more social studies outcomes, I have learned to create my own dramas. There were not always published dramas that pertained to the specific topics in the social studies guide (1981). I feel more confident in creating high quality dramas that push students to challenge their own beliefs and to make informed decisions. But it is only with the extensive experience and practice gained through the research project that I feel confident in doing so.

Previously, I had taught whole units using drama but now I have broadened my pedagogy to include occasional drama structures in various subject areas. For example, when teaching a math unit, I used a drama game to help the students solidify their knowledge of the properties of diagonals in quadrilaterals. After using manipulatives to develop the concepts, the students needed to commit the language and concepts to memory. Using a drama game made the task more enjoyable than simple rote memorization. I also adapted many games for use in teaching French. Getting students to speak French was a challenge. Drama games provided a safe, fun opportunity for students to practice phrases as well as to hear and understand spoken language.

I recognized that for me the most challenging part of using drama was the element of surprise, the unpredictability, the provisional nature of the situation. Knowing there could be surprise did not make the situation any easier to guide. I could not prepare or anticipate any situation and when surprises occurred I often felt that I should have managed them better. I could have encouraged or challenged the students more. I could have asked better questions. Because of the uniqueness of

each situation, I found it difficult to learn lessons to apply to the next situation. Although each circumstance taught me a great deal, the next one was totally different with a new lesson to be learned. One lesson, though, that cuts through all of my drama activities is that it is important to wait and to let the students maintain their control of the situation. Despite wanting to have a classroom in which students were active participants, I struggled with reverting to the teacher-controlled situation that I experienced as a student. It was the element of surprise that brought feelings of wanting to control to the forefront. When I was placed in a situation where I was unsure of what to do, the need to control, to be in charge and to manage the situation arose. Also, from these surprises came missed opportunities.

In the dramas there were times when opportunities appeared that I did not take advantage of. There were distinct reasons for each missed opportunity. Sometimes when working with another class it was a time constraint. But often I made a wrong decision. My experience with *A Highwayman Came Riding* (Flemming, 2000) which I taught to my class in Year Three provides a prime example of poor judgment on my part. The author of the drama had set out a series of activities that I was following. One activity, which I thought was an excellent idea, was an investigation to determine who was responsible for Bess' death. I never considered that a student might want to investigate the Highwayman's death and I did not consider the possibility when John suggested it. While I was telling him that he had to investigate Bess' death, I knew I was making a mistake but I charged ahead, maintaining complete control of the situation. He was thinking critically and

creatively and I prevented him from continuing. I have recreated a short script of the conversation that took place in class that day:

But My Mom . . .

Setting: Grade six classroom

Teacher: This is your assignment. You are investigating the death of an innocent bystander in a police action. You must find out who is responsible for Bess' death.

John: Can't we find out why the Highwayman was killed?

Teacher: That's a good idea, John, but the assignment is to find out who's responsible for Bess' death. She was the innocent bystander. The Highwayman was a criminal.

John: But my mom would want to know why I was killed by the police even if I was a robber.

Teacher: Maybe another time. Right now I want you to concentrate on Bess.

Often we, as teachers, have our own agenda and forge ahead with it regardless of the suggestions of our students. I know that when I stop and listen to students and follow their lead the results can be amazing. This is only one example of a missed opportunity but it was not the only one. It simply represents all the other times that I failed to allow a student to follow his or her initiative. Now, I am far more alert to students' suggestions. Having used this drama on subsequent occasions, I have hoped and waited for another student to make the same suggestion. Unfortunately, it has never reoccurred, nor should I expect it to.

Although I was often able to integrate social studies and other subjects, at times I felt I could not. Scambell City was the most ambitious drama I attempted. I

felt it accomplished much in terms of giving agency to the students, learning about citizenship, governing and economics. For the most part the students willingly accepted the responsibilities they were given. But it did have its drawbacks. I think that the students' opportunities to actively engage in governing themselves more than fulfilled the outcomes (APEF, 1999) of Citizenship, Governance and Power, in addition to other key stage strands; however, I was less able to involve the students in activities related to other course outcomes. Social studies was not the only subject that I had to teach. Outcomes also had to be fulfilled in mathematics, language arts, French, science and visual art. Although I could include mathematics in Scambell City, those lessons did not fulfill the mathematics outcomes. The running of Scambell City required many more hours of class time than the weekly two hours allotted to social studies. I could often combine language arts with social studies but I could not find the time to provide experiences in all of the strands identified in the APEF document.

The drama experiences that took place in Scambell City over the two years were quite different from class to class, demonstrating how the nature of the drama cannot have predictable or expected outcomes (Phelps & Hase, 2002). During the first year the students were actively engaged and took the situation seriously. They created a court system. In the second year, the first election of the Senate became more of a popularity contest. One student, a newcomer to the school without many friends, took the election very seriously, but did not get elected despite being a very good candidate with good intentions. His lack of voter popularity mirrored a "real life" situation. The lack of predictability was also evidenced in the court system.

Because I was concerned about the students' TV version of a courtroom that had been created in the first year, I felt that if the students had more background in how court actually proceeds, it would be more successful. Consequently, I asked a parent, who was a lawyer, to help the students understand how to conduct a court case. Despite the workshops given to the students, no court cases arose. I felt I had jinxed the situation by becoming involved. I had provided the information and the idea but I could not predict nor could I control the outcome. The students took control of the drama and it emerged as they saw fit. The desire to take citizens to court for wrongdoing did not fit within the parameters of their city-state.

David Barnet (personal communication, June 2006) suggested to me that rhythm is a key ingredient in any drama. As I reflected on his statement, I came to realize that it was not the rhythm that I was aware of but, rather, the discord. When the drama was unfolding as the students and I saw fit, there was no discord. The rhythm of the unfolding had to fit with both mine and the students' intents. All of us were involved in this activity. If I tried to control too much, discord surfaced. If the students did not listen to others, including me, discord arose. Those discordant moments were moments to pay close attention to. They informed me on how to proceed; I had only to listen. The essential lesson was two-fold: first, that I had a voice within the drama but it was only one voice among many and, secondly, that I needed to listen for the discord.

For all that I have learned, how much have I changed? Most significantly, I have learned to wait. That waiting is trussed by a belief that the children can and will rise to the occasion. Because of this belief in the children, I continue to take risks,

not anticipating a right way to proceed. I am willing to be incautious and see what transpires.

Conclusion

I return to a question: what kind of teacher does it take to use drama? The teacher must be a risk taker. The teacher must have confidence in the ability of the students to accept responsibility for their learning. The teacher must have a solid knowledge of the expectations or outcomes of the curriculum in order to recognize how drama can fulfill those expectations. The teacher must allow the curriculum to emerge, accepting the unpredictability of the classroom. The teacher must be able to accept that there will be an element of surprise, understanding that the element of surprise will place them in a precarious position, a position that will lead them into uncharted territories. The teacher needs to accept that he or she may not make the best decision in these situations and that it is acceptable. The teacher must have enough confidence in her abilities to try innovative structures and to modify those structures as she sees fit. To that end, the teacher must also be looking for or creating new structures. She must be a life-long learner. To recap, the teacher who uses drama is a risk taker, innovative, knowledgeable, accepting, confident, and believes in her students.

Within this research study, I utilized for support the notion of agency (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998), citizenship education (I. Wright, 2003), moral education (Winston, 1997) and socially critical action research (Tripp, 1990). Each has a unique perspective but all worked well together, complementing the tenets of

each other. These frames of reference in turn were manifested through the use of the dramatic structures of Heathcote (Heathcote et al., 1991) and Boal (1992).

In merging these diverse theories and practices, I have been able to achieve my goals. I created dramas that incorporated the structures of both Boal (1992) and Heathcote (Heathcote et al., 1991). The SCAR project initiated changes in practice of ten teachers. We were able to fulfill both the vision statement and the key outcomes of many strands of the APEF Social Studies Foundation document (1999). The teachers were able to fulfill their intents of challenging and supporting students, improving both the curricula and pedagogy of social studies and achieving the outcomes of the APEF. Lastly, I feel I demonstrated the ways in which the use of drama as a pedagogical tool encouraged teachers to teach social studies.

References

Ackroyd, J. (1998). *Key Shakespeare : English and drama activities for teaching Shakespeare to 10-14 year olds*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Ackroyd, J. (2000). *Literacy alive!: drama projects for literacy learning*. London: Hodder & Stoughton Educational.

Ackroyd, J., & Boulton, J. (2001). *Drama lessons for five to eleven-year-olds*. London: David Fulton.

APEF, A. P. E. F. (1999). *Foundation for the Atlantic Canada social studies curriculum*. Retrieved. from https://sapps.ednet.ns.ca/Cart/description.php?II=90&UID=20071213113159142.167.170.123.

Arendt, H. (1968). *Between past and future : eight exercises in political thought* ([Enl. ed.). New York: Viking Press.

Atweh, B., Kemmis, S., & Weeks, P. (1998). *Action research in practice : partnership for social justice in education*. London ; New York: Routledge.

Bai, H. (2006). Philosophy for education: towards human agency. *Paideusis, 15*(1), 7-19.

Bailin, S. (1998). Critical thinking and drama education. *Research in drama education, 3*(2), 145-154.

Bailin, S., Case, R., Coombs, J. R., & Daniels, L. B. (1999). Common misconceptions of critical thinking. *Journal of curriculum studies, 31*(3), 269-283.

Baldwin, P. (1991). *Stimulating drama : cross curricular approaches to drama in the primary school.* Norfolk County Council: County INSET Centre.

Baldwin, P., & Fleming, K. (2002). *Teaching literacy through drama: creative approaches.* London: Routledge/Falmer.

Barnes, J., & Kennedy, E. D. (2003). The Oxford Encyclopedia of Theatre and Performance. Retrieved 2 December, 2005, from http://www.oxfordreference.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t177.e1893

Beyer, B. (1998). Improving student thinking. *Clearing House, 71*(5), 262-267.

Bland, D. (2004). *The role of critical imagination in research with young people.* Paper presented at the AARE.

Blythe, D., & Nemoianu, V. (1979). Keat's "To Autumn". *PMLA, 94*(5), 945-946.

Boal, A. (1979). *Theater of the oppressed.* New York: Urizen Books.

Boal, A. (1992). *Games for actors and non-actors.* New York: Routledge.

Boal, A. (1995). *The rainbow of desire : the Boal method of theatre and therapy.* New York: Routledge.

Bolton, G., M. (1984). *Drama as education : an argument for placing drama at the centre of the curriculum.* Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Bolton, G., M. (1998). *Acting in classroom drama : a critical analysis.* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books in association with the University of Central England.

Bolton, G., M., & Heathcote, D. (1995). *Drama for learning: Dorothy Heathcote's mantle of the expert approach to education.* Portsmouth, N.H. ; London: Heinemann.

Booth, D. (1994). *Story drama : reading, writing, and role-playing across the curriculum*. Markham, Ont.: Pembroke Publishers.

Bradley, J. G. (2004). Constructing a powerful approach to teaching and learning in elementary social studies *Canadian social studies, 38*(3 Spring).

Brunelle, L. (1999). Expecting espect. *ATA News, 33*(10).

Cabral, B. (1996). Signs of a post-modern, yet dialectic, practice. *Research in drama education, 1*(2), 215-221.

Callan, E. (1997). *Creating citizens : political education and liberal democracy*. Oxford New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press.

Chuska, K. R., & Phi Delta Kappa. Educational Foundation. (1986). *Teaching the process of thinking, K-12*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Clandinin, J., & Connelly, M. (1990). Narrative, experience and the study of curriculum. *Cambridge journal of education, 20*(3), 241-254.

Clandinin, J. C., Michael. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. xii, 643 p.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Clark, J. (1997). *Lessons for the living : drama and the integrated curriculum*. Newmarket, Ont.: Mayfair Cornerstone.

Clark, P. (2004). The historical context of social studies in English Canada. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Eds.), *Challenges & prospects for Canadian social studies*. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Coates, K. (2000). *The Marshall decision and native rights*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Coleridge, S. T. (1984). *Biographia literaria : or, Biographical sketches of my literary life and opinions*. London: J. M. Dent ;E. P. Dutton.

Conrad, D. H. (2004). *"Life in the sticks" : youth experiences, risk & popular theatre process.* University of Alberta. Dept. of Secondary Education.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.

Cummins, J., Danesi, M., & Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation. (1990). *Heritage languages : the development and denial of Canada's linguistic resources*. Toronto: Our Schools Our Selves Education Foundation.

Davis, B. (2004). *Inventions of teaching: a genealogy*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Davis, B. (2005). Interpreting frameworks: Interpreting geometries of epistomology and curriculum. In W. E. Doll, M. J. Fleener & J. St. Julien (Eds.), *Chaos, complexity, curriculum and culture : a conversation* (pp. x, 329 p.). New York: P. Lang.

Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (2002). Constructivist discourses and the field of education: problems and possibilities. *Educational theory, 52*(4), 409-429.

Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (2005). Complexity science and educational action research: toward a pragmatics of transformation. *Educational action research, 13*(3), 453-464.

Denzin, N. K. (2002). The interpretive process. In A. M. Huberman & M. B. Miles (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Des Rosiers, N., Colas, B., Wood, R. J., & Stevenson, M. L. (2004). *Voting counts: electoral reform for Canada*. Retrieved. from http://www.fairvotecanada.org/files/VotingCountsElectoralReformforCanada.pdf.

Dilthey, W. (1989). The development of hermeneutics. In B. A. Wilson (Ed.), *About interpretation : from Plato to Dilthey : a hermeneutic anthology* (Vol. American university studies. Series V, Philosophy, vol. 30, pp. xii, 208 p.). New York: P. Lang.

Edmiston, B. (1996). Playing in different keys: research notes for action researchers and reflective drama practitioners. In P. Taylor (Ed.), *Researching drama and arts education : paradigms and possibilities* (pp. xvi, 205). Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Edmiston, B. (2000). Drama as ethical education. *Research in drama education, 5*(1), 63-85.

Edwards, J., & Payne, P. (1994). A drama support group: context for teacher change. *Youth Theatre Journal, 8*(3), 19-23.

Egan, K. (1989). *Teaching as story telling: an alternative approach to teaching and curriculum in the elementary school*. Chicago.

Egan, K. (1999). *Children's minds, talking rabbits, and clockwork oranges: essays on education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Ely, M. (1997). *On writing qualitative research: living by words*. London ; Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Emirbayer, M., & Mische, A. (1998). What is agency? *The American journal of sociology, 103*(4), 962-1023.

Ennis, R. H. (1996). *Critical thinking*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Farr Darling, L., & Wright, I. (2004). Crtical thinking and the "social" in social studies. In I. Wright & A. Sears (Eds.), *Challenges & prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 312 p.). Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Flemming, M. (2000). A highwayman comes riding. In J. Ackroyd (Ed.), *Literacy alive!: Drama projects for literacy learning*. London: Hodder & Stoughton Educational.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Fullan, M. (1993). Why teachers must become change agents. *Educational leadership, March*, 12-17.

Gadamer, H. G. (1975). *Truth and method*. New York: Seabury Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1991). Beyond the ethics of flag waving: Schooling and citizenship for a critical democracy. *Clearing House, 64*(5), 305-309.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination : essays on education, the arts, and social change* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Greene, M. (1996). Plurality, diversity, and the public space. In A. Oldenquist (Ed.), *Can democracy be taught?* Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Greenwood, D. J., & Levin, M. (1998). *Introduction to action research : social research for social change*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Grundy, S. (1988). Three modes of action research. In S. Kemmis, R. McTaggart & Deakin University. School of Education. Open Campus Program. (Eds.), *The action research reader*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Heaney, M. (1999). The playwright's workshop as action research: a case study. *Research in drama education, 4*(2), 239-246.

Heathcote, D., Johnson, L., & O'Neill, C. (1991). *Collected writings on education and drama*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.

Hundert, D. (1996). Teacher perceptions of the value and status of drama in education: a study of one Ontario school board. *Youth Theatre Journal, 10*, 25-35.

Janesick, V. J. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design: minuets, improvisations, and crystallization. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Johnston, I. (2000). Literature and social studies: reading the hyphenated spaces of Canadian identity. *Canadian Social studies, 35*(1).

Johnston, I. (2001). English language arts, citizenship and national identity. *Canadian Social studies, 35*(3).

Kaaland-Wells, C. (1994). Classroom teachers' perceptions and uses of creative drama. *Youth Theatre Journal, 8*(4), 21-26.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2005). Participatory action research: communicative action and the public sphere. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The*

SAGE handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. xix, 1210 p.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Kincheloe, J. L. (1989). *Getting beyond the facts : teaching social studies in the late twentieth century*. New York: P. Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). *Getting beyond the facts : teaching social studies/social sciences in the twenty-first century* (2nd ed.). New York: P. Lang.

Kirby, D., & Kuykendall, C. (1991). *Mind matters : teaching for thinking*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Kogawa, J. (1994). *Obasan* (1st Anchor Books ed.). New York: Anchor Books.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship : a liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.

Laidlaw, L. (2000). Drama and complexity: teaching at the edge. *Youth Theatre Journal, 15*, 15 - 22.

League of peaceful schools. (2000). Retrieved November 8, 2007, from http://www.lawrencetown.ednet.ns.ca/lps.htm

Longfellow, H. W. (2004). *Evangeline: A tale of Acadie*. Fredericton, N.B.: Goose Lane

Lowry, L. (1994). *The giver*. New York, N.Y.: Bantam Doubleday Dell Books for Young Readers.

MacIntyre, A. C. (1981). *After virtue : a study in moral theory*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.

Massie, R. K. (1967). *Nicholas and Alexandra* ([1st ed.). New York: Atheneum.

Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. (1992). *The tree of knowledge : the biological roots of human understanding* (Rev. ed.). Boston, New York: Shambhala; Distributed in the U.S. by Random House.

McCarthy, C. (1990). Multicultural education, minority identities, textbooks, and the challenge of curriculum reform. *Journal of education, 172*(2), 118-130.

Merryfield, M.M. & Subedi, B, (2001). Decolonizing the mind for world-centered global education. In E. Wayne Ross (Ed.), *Contemporary perspectives on the social studies curriculum* (pp.277-290), 2nd edition. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Murray, J., & Ozanne, J. (1991). The critical imagination: emancipatory interests in comsumer research. *Journal of consumer research, 18*(2), 129-144.

Neelands, J. (1992). *Learning through imagined experience : the role of drama in the National Curriculum*. London: Hodder & Stoughton Educational.

Neelands, J. (1998). *Beginning drama 11-14*. London: David Fulton.

Norris, J. (2001). Living citizenship through popular theatre, process drama and playbuilding.

Noyes, A., & Keeping, C. (1981). *The highwayman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

N. S. Department of Education and Culture. (1999). *Drama 10 and drama 11 curriculumguide*. Retrieved from https://sapps.ednet.ns.ca/Cart/description.php?II=12&UID=20080128104940 142.167.176.47

N. S. Department of Education. (2003). *Public school program*. Retrieved from

http://www.ednet.ns.ca/pdfdocs/psp/psp_03_04_full.pdf

N. S. Department of Education. (1981) *Social studies for elementary schools* (Teaching guide no. 77). Halifax, NS.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity : a classical defense of reform in liberal education.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

O'Neill, C. (1995). *Drama worlds : a framework for process drama.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

O'Neill, C., & Lambert, A. (1982). *Drama structures : a practical handbook for teachers.* London: Hutchinson.

O'Toole, J., & Burton, B. (2005). Acting against conflict and bullying: the Brisbane DRACON project 1196-2004 - emergent findings and outcomes. *Research in drama education, 10*(3), 269-283.

O'Toole, J., & Dunn, J. (2002). *Pretending to learn : helping children learn through drama.* Frenchs Forest, N.S.W.: Pearson Education.

Osborne, K. (1997). Social studies in Canada. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Eds.), *Trends & issues in Canadian social studies* (pp. 384 p.). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.

Osborne, K. (2000 Special Issue). Public schooling and citizenship education in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 32*(1).

Paulsen, G. (1993). *Nightjohn.* New York: Laurel-Leaf Books.

Phelps, R., & Hase, S. (2002). Complexity and action reaserach: exploring the theoretical and methodological connections. *Educational action research, 10*(3), 507-523.

Purdy, C. (2006, March 18). There's a hole in my heart. *Edmonton Journal,* p. A3.

Renk, H.-E. (1993). The art form of drama and the new paradigm of constructivism. In E. P. Errington (Ed.), *Arts education : beliefs, practices and possibilities* (pp. [iv], 206 p.). Geelong, Vic.: Deakin University Press.

Reynolds, G. (2000). Teaching First Nations history as Canadian history. *Canadian Social studies, 34*(3), 44-47.

Richardson, G., & Judah, M.-L. (2002). Self-improvement or ironic awareness: the divergent culture of action research.

Richardson, G. (2004). Global Education and the Challenge of Globalization. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Eds.), *New Trends and Issues in Canadian Social Studies 3rd Ed.* Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press, pp. 138-149.

Robert, H. M., & Vixman, R. (1984). *Robert's rules of order*. New York: Jove Book.

Ross, E. W. (2001). The struggle for social studies curriculum. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum : purposes, problems, and possibilities* (Rev. ed., pp. ix, 350 p.). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rubright, L. (1996). *Beyond the beanstalk: interdisciplinary learning through storytelling*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Saldaña, J. (1999). Playwriting with data: Ethnographic performance texts. *Youth Theatre Journal, 12*, 60-71.

Saldaña, J. (2003). Dramatizing data: A primer. *Qualitative Inquiry, 9*(2), 218-236.

Sears, A. (1997). Social studies in Canada. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Eds.), *Trends & issues in Canadian social studies*. Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.

Sears, A. (2004). In search of good citizens: Citizenship education adn social studies in Canada. In I. Wright & A. Sears (Eds.), *Challenges & prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 312 p.). Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Sears, A., & Wright, I. (1997). *Trends & issues in Canadian social studies.* Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.

Shields, P., & Ramsay, D. (2004). Social studies across English Canada. In I. Wright & A. Sears (Eds.), *Challenges & prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 312 p.). Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Sills-Briegel, T., & Camp, D. (2000). Using literature to explore social issues. *Social studies, 91*(3), 116-120.

Simmt, E. (2001). EDSE 511 Research design. Edmontom, AB: University of Alberta.

Somers, J. (1994). *Drama in the curriculum.* London: Cassell.

Spence-Campbell, S. (2001). *Creative drama teacher survey* (Unpublished survey results). Nova Scotia.

Stringer, E. (1996). *Action research: a handbook for practitioners.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.

Suh, B. K., & Traiger, J. (1999). Teaching values through elementary social studies and literature curricula. *Education, 119*(4), 723-728.

Tappan, M. (1998). Moral education in the zone of proximal development. *Journal of moral education, 27*(2), 141-161.

Tatar, M. (2002). *The annotated classic fairy tales* (M. Tatar, Trans.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Taylor, P. (1996). Doing reflective practitioner research in arts education. In P. Taylor (Ed.), *Researching drama and arts education : paradigms and possibilities* (pp. xvi, 205). Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Thompson, E. (2001). Empathy and consciousness. *Journal of consciousness studies, 8*(5-7), 1-32.

Toye, N., & Prendiville, F. (2000). *Drama and traditional story for the early years.* London ; New York: Routledge 2000.

Tripp, D. (1990). Socially critical action research. *Theory into practice, xxix*(3), 158-166.

van Manen, M. (2005). Phemomenology: The experience of "experience". Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.

Varma-Joshi, M. (2004). Understanding multiculturalism in the social studies classroom. In I. Wright & A. Sears (Eds.), *Challenges & prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 312 p.). Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society : the development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wagner, B. J. (1999a). *Building moral communities through educational drama.* Stamford, CT ; London: Ablex Pub. Corp.

Wagner, B. J. (1999b). *Dorothy Heathcote : drama as a learning medium.* Portsmith NH: Heinemann.

Waters, S. (1999). Children's literature: a valuable resource for the social studies classroom. *Canadian Social studies, 33*(3), 80-83.

Watson, F. (2007). Experienced reflections. Retrieved October 19, 2007, from http://www.vermontcommunityworks.org/cwpublications/journal/cwjexpreflect/watson/watson.html

Weaver, C. (1985). Parallels between new paradigms in science and in reading and literary theories: an essay review. *Research in the teaching of English, 19*(3), 298-316.

Wellington, J. J. (2000). *Educational research: contemporary issues and practical approaches*. London ; New York: Continuum.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice : learning, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Werner, W., & Case, R. (1997). Themes of global education. In I. Wright & A. Sears (Eds.), *Trends and issues in Canadian social studies*. Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.

Whitehead, R. H. (Ed.). (1992). *Six Micmac stories*. Halifax, NS: Nimbus Publishing and Nova Scotia Museum.

Wilhelm, J., D., & Edmiston, B. (1998). *Imagining to learn : inquiry, ethics, and integration through drama*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Winston, J. (1997). *Drama, narrative and moral education: exploring traditional tales in the primary years*. London: Falmer.

Winston, J. (2000a). *Drama, literacy and moral education 5-11*. London: David Fulton.

Winston, J. (2000b). The gargoyles creep. In J. Ackroyd (Ed.), *Literacy alive! drama project for literacy learning*. London: Hodder & Stoughton Educational.

Winston, J., & Tandy, M. (1998). *Beginning drama 4-11*. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Wright, D. (2000). Drama education: a 'self organizing system" in pursuit of learning. *Research in drama education, 5*(1), 23-31.

Wright, I. (1995). *Elementary social studies: a practical approach to teaching and learning*. Scarborough, ON: Nelson Canada.

Wright, I. (2003). The centrality of critical thinking in citizenship education [Electronic Version]. *Canadian social studies, 38* from http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css/Css_38_1/ARcentrality_critical_thinking.htm.